



LIBRARY  
OF THE  
Theological Seminary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

Case

Division P. 45

Shelf

Section 2541

Book

No. 1473

BS2625

.4.B62



THE  
H I S T O R Y  
OF  
THE ACTS  
OF  
THE HOLY APOSTLES  
CONFIRMED FROM OTHER AUTHORS;  
AND CONSIDERED AS FULL EVIDENCE OF  
THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY:

WITH  
A PRÉFATORY DISCOURSE UPON THE NATURE OF THAT  
EVIDENCE.

---

BY RICHARD BISCOE, M.A.

---

OXFORD,  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS.

MDCCCXXIX.

THE HISTORY OF

THE CITY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

THE HISTORY OF

BY RICHARD BIRCH, M.A.

OXFORD

AT THE CLarendon PRESS

1724

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

IT is right that the reader should be informed that this Work is the substance of Sermons delivered at the Lecture founded by the Honourable Robert Boyle, in the years 1736, 1737, 1738.

It is reprinted from the London edition, 1742.





# THE CONTENTS.

---

THE Prefatory Discourse	-	-	-	-	1
The Introduction and scheme	-	-	-	-	13

## CHAP. I.

A short view of the facts contained in the History of the Acts, with some natural reflections thence arising	27
--	----

## CHAP. II.

What is written in the History of the Acts of the ordinary occurrences of that time, and of the great persons therein named, confirmed from other authors	37
---	----

## CHAP. III.

A further account of the occurrences of the time, and of the persons named	51
--	----

## CHAP. IV.

How far the various distinctions of the Jews, which happen to be spoken of in the Acts, are confirmed by other authors	76
--	----

## CHAP. V.

How far the Jewish customs referred to are confirmed	95
--	----

## CHAP. VI.

### PART I.

The Jewish magistrates in Judæa, when under the Romans, had the power of inflicting capital punishments	113
---	-----

The Introduction to this	- - - -	113
SECT. I. An answer to the first argument against it, taken from the civil law	- - - -	116
SECT. II. The second and third arguments, taken from the civil law, answered	- - - -	124
SECT. III. The principal argument, taken from the New Testament, answered	- - - -	130
SECT. IV. An answer to two other arguments taken from the New Testament	- - - -	142
SECT. V. The Romans frequently indulged the nations they conquered in the use of their own laws, even in capital cases	- - - -	145
SECT. VI. The Romans were peculiarly favourable to the Jews, and allowed them singular privileges in all parts of the empire	- - - -	164
SECT. VII. The Jews petitioned the emperor Augustus that their country might be made a Roman province, with this view, that they might have the free use of their own laws	- - - -	170
SECT. VIII. The reasons we have to believe that the emperor Augustus granted to the Jews what they had in view in this petition	- - - -	174
SECT. IX. Passages from Josephus and Philo, proving that the Romans did grant to the Jews the execution of their own laws even in capital cases	- - - -	180
SECT. X. Objections answered	- - - -	185
SECT. XI. Other passages from Josephus, proving that the Jewish magistrates had the power of putting persons to death in the execution of their own laws	- - - -	193
SECT. XII. Passages from the Talmud to the same purpose, and the Talmudical account very consistent with the History of Josephus	- - - -	202
SECT. XIII. An argument of another nature, rendering it highly probable that the Jewish magistrates under the Romans had the execution of their own laws in capital cases	- - - -	208
SECT. XIV. Arguments taken from the sacred writings to prove the same thing	- - - -	210



# CONTENTS.

vii

SECT. XV. Further arguments from the History of  
the Acts - - - - - 215

SECT. XVI. Arguments to the same purpose from the  
Gospels - - - - - 220

SECT. XVII. Further arguments from the Gospels  
227

## PART II.

The authority of the high priest and Jewish magistrates in  
the affairs of religion extended to foreign cities 234

## CHAP. VII.

More Jewish customs confirmed - - - 244

## CHAP. VIII.

Grecian customs confirmed - - - 265

## CHAP. IX.

Roman customs confirmed - - - 300

## CHAP. X.

An account of the places referred to - - 332

## CHAP. XI.

The principal facts confirmed - - - 362

## CHAP. XII.

A further confirmation of the principal facts - 389

## CHAP. XIII.

A further confirmation of the principal facts -

## CHAP. XIV.

The History of the Acts written by St. Luke

## CHAP. XV.

The Acts of the Apostles was owned and rec  
Christians of the first ages as a sacred book

## CHAP. XVI.

A brief recapitulation of the things said in the foregoing chapter, together with the evidence thence arising of the truth and certainty of the principal matters related in the Acts	- - - - -	482
---	-----------	-----

## CHAP. XVII.

The evidence of the truth of Christianity arising from the principal facts related	- - - - -	513
--	-----------	-----

## CHAP. XVIII.

The objections raised by rabbi Isaac ben Abraham answered	- - - - -	539
---	-----------	-----

## CHAP. XIX.

Further objections of that rabbi answered	-	561
---	---	-----

## CHAP. XX.

Other objections answered	- - - - -	579
---------------------------	-----------	-----

THE  
PREFATORY DISCOURSE.

---

1 PET. i. 8.

*Whom having not seen, ye love ; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.*

**T**HERE are three graces mentioned here by the apostle, each of which has a commendation annexed to it. The first is love to Christ, spoken of as raised and ennobled by this circumstance, that it was loving one whom they had not seen ; it being far more difficult to place our affections on a person we have never seen, than on one whom we see and converse with. To have an unseen Saviour frequently in our minds, to be often thinking on the excellencies of his person, the greatness of his performance, his wonderful love to us, the sufferings he underwent upon our account, and the blessings he has thereby procured ; to make these things the subject of our frequent, serious meditations, so as to excite a holy flame in our souls, is a matter of pains and labour and difficulty ; especially since our hearts are so apt to be entangled with the things of sense, and what we daily see and converse with so easily gains our affections ; since the love also which is required of us towards the blessed Jesus must exceed that of all things here below, so that we must readily part with them for his sake whenever called out unto it.



The second grace mentioned by the apostle is faith in Christ, *in whom believing*. This, though mentioned in the second place, is the first in order. For we therefore love Christ, because we believe in him. If we have neither seen him, nor believe in him, it is impossible we should love him. But although we see him not, yet, if we believe in him, we may, and, if we will act like reasonable creatures, we must both love and obey him. *Believing in Christ* signifies our assenting to the truth of those things which are related concerning him in the Gospels, particularly that he was *in the beginning with God, and is God*; that *all things were made by him*; that he condescended to take to him the human nature, led a poor suffering life, and died a cruel lingering death; that he died thus to make atonement for our sins, and reconcile us to God; that the Father was well pleased with the sacrifice he made of himself, raised him from the dead, and has committed all power into his hands; that one day he will come again, attended with the holy angels; raise the dead; cite all, both quick and dead, to appear at his awful tribunal, and pass sentence on them according to their deeds, rendering eternal happiness to those who have obeyed him, the severest everlasting punishment to those who have not. If we yield our assent to the truth of these things, can it be said that we act like rational beings, unless, by submission and obedience to Christ, we prepare for this great and solemn day of reckoning? It is of those who so believe the gospel as to obey it that the apostle is here speaking; for he joins love and joy to the faith mentioned. The faith therefore which the apostle commends is such an assent to

the truth of the gospel as has an influence on the heart and life, such as begets in us a sincere and ardent love to Christ, and is the foundation of a true and solid joy; *Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory*, or of praise; a joy truly praiseworthy, approved and applauded by God and all good men, and secretly commended by the consciences even of the wicked themselves. Such a joy proceeds from that faith alone which is fruitful in love and good works.

What I propose to consider more particularly at this time is, the commendation given to the grace of faith, as exercised by the persons the apostle writes to; *In whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing*: it was faith in a Saviour whom they had not seen. That this circumstance adds a lustre to faith is confirmed to us by our Lord himself, who says to Thomas, *Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed*, John xx. 29. *Blessed are they*; i. e. they are more blessed. Whence we may justly conclude that their faith is more praiseworthy.

That we may the better understand how this circumstance adds a lustre to faith, and renders it more commendable, I would offer these two or three things to your consideration: first, this does not in the least imply that in divine matters we are not to seek after proper evidence for what we believe. When the apostle commends the Christians he wrote to for believing in a Saviour whom they had not seen; and our Lord blames Thomas for his in-

credulity, and applauds the faith of such who believed in him, though they had not seen him; it is not hereby intended to discourage persons from looking after proper evidence in such matters of religion as are proposed to their belief, or to hint to them that they should blindly assent to things, as the truths of God, without having clear proof given them of their being so. This would be greatly to demean and misemploy the faculties bestowed on us. To what end have we a capacity of searching into and examining the truth of things? Why has God given us a power of considering the evidences that are offered, and judging of their weight and force, if he did not intend it should be exercised by us? That he designed it should be exercised, we are fully informed in the sacred writings, and are exhorted to it. Our blessed Lord, John v. 32. 39, calls upon the Jews to consider the evidence given them of his being the Son of God. He appeals to the testimony of John the Baptist, to the testimony of his Father, by a voice from heaven, and to the miraculous works he enabled him to perform, and to the testimony of the holy scriptures; *Search the scriptures; for in them ye think that ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.* In many places he appeals to the evidence he gave them of being their Messiah by the wonders he wrought; and, John x. 37, assures them that he expected not any credit from them, if he gave them not full proof hereof by his works; *If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.* In another place he plainly declares, that, if he had not given them clear evidence by his miracles of his being the Son of God, their unbelief had been excusable,



John xv. 24. *If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin.* The Bereans are highly applauded for searching into the truth of those things which were spoken by St. Paul, Acts xvii. 11. *These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.* And the apostle John exhorts us, 1 John iv. 1. *Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world.* This therefore most certainly cannot be the meaning of the commendation here given to the faith of these persons, to discourage and prevent our looking after proper evidence for the things that are proposed to us in matters of religion, because this is a thing which the holy scriptures do indeed every where encourage what they command us to do, and applaud Christians for doing. But,

2dly, The plain meaning of it is, that, when proper evidence is offered, we should yield our assent. When such evidence is offered for the truth of those things, which are proposed to our belief in religious matters, as wise men commonly act upon in the affairs and concernments of the present life, we are to yield our assent to the truth of those things, and to act accordingly. Herein Thomas was wanting; and it is this failure of his is blamed by our Lord. He did not yield to proper evidence, to that evidence which could not have been gainsaid by him in any other case, and that was the testimony of many credible persons who had seen our Lord after his resurrection. As to the thing reported by them,

there was nothing improbable in it, because our Lord had not only expressly foretold that he would rise the third day, but had rendered what he said highly credible, by the many exceeding great works that he wrought in his lifetime, by his giving sight to the blind, healing the paralytic, restoring withered limbs, and raising some to life that were actually dead. Since therefore he who had performed such wonders, he who had raised others from death, foretold his own resurrection, there was nothing incredible in the fact related.

Peter and John went to his sepulchre, and found his body missing. Mary Magdalen, who had been there before them, and by her report occasioned their going, returning again to the sepulchre with them, when they were departed, saw Jesus risen, and spake with him. He was afterwards, on the same day, seen by Simon Peter, and by two other disciples, who conversed with him in their way to Emmaus; and on the evening of the same day by the disciples assembled together in a body, who examined the wounds made in his hands and feet, and saw him eat part of a broiled fish and of a honeycomb. These relate the fact to Thomas, who nevertheless would not believe it, but said, *Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.* This was rejecting such evidence as all men govern themselves by, and act upon, in other cases. The thing related was indeed more than probable from the prediction of our Saviour, who had given such ample proof of his being a *person sent from God*, and was confirmed by the joint testimony of many

eyewitnesses, persons whose credibility he had not the least reason to suspect, and who could have no interest in deceiving him. This unbelief therefore was highly unreasonable, and what he is most justly blamed for.

Hence we may easily learn what is the faith commended by our Lord in the Gospel of St. John, and by the apostle in my text. It is a faith built upon such evidence as wise men assent to and act upon in the most important concerns of the present life: *Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.* “Thou wouldst not believe my resurrection, unless thou didst see me with thine own eyes, and handlest my wounds, although thou hadst received plain and full evidence of the truth thereof. Their faith is more to be esteemed and praised, who, although they have not seen me themselves, yet believe my resurrection from the report of those many eye and earwitnesses who have seen me and conversed with me.” From comparing the words of my text with this part of our Lord’s history, the plain meaning of the commendation given to the grace of faith in my text, as exercised by those Christians the apostle wrote to, from this circumstance, that they had believed in him whom they had not seen, appears to be, not in the least to discourage them from looking after all fitting and suitable evidence of the truth of those things which are proposed to their belief in the gospel; for this is made their duty; but to encourage them in yielding their assent to truths built upon such evidence as we generally govern ourselves by

in the most momentous affairs of the present life, and in acting agreeably thereto.

Were we to believe nothing but what we are eye or earwitnesses of, the business of the world would be soon at a stand. There could be little trade or commerce carried on in distant parts of the world; there could be no such thing as fixed courts of judicature; there could be no policy or government, nor would there be much comfort in life itself. In the affairs of this world we are forced to yield to probable arguments and the testimony of others, and upon this ground we proceed in the most important concernments. When a thing probable in itself is related by persons of credit, who we have no reason to suspect would deceive us, we not only yield our assent to it, but govern ourselves by it. Thus it is in all matters of commerce; thus it is in all courts of judicature, not only in civil, but in criminal cases, wherein the liberties and lives of men are concerned: and thus it is in the arduous affairs of policy and government, be they never so important. Now if in matters of religion we have the same evidence as we have in those which are the greatest and most important concernments of life, and notwithstanding will not yield to this evidence, but require more, is not this highly blameworthy? On the other hand, is it not right, and fitting, and commendable, to yield to such proof, and act agreeably thereto? for,

3dly, To act upon such evidence shews our inclination and readiness to obey the will of God. To assent to the truth of those things which we see with our own eyes, and can no longer doubt of, as

Thomas did, is no ways praiseworthy. But to consider and examine the evidence of what is offered to us as a truth coming from God, and containing his mind; and when we find there is the same evidence for it as we are usually governed by in the greatest and most momentous affairs of the present life, then to give our assent to it, so as to govern ourselves by it, is truly commendable. This discovers a devout frame and temper of mind, a mind prepared to do the will of God in every thing it knows to be such; it shews a desire to understand, and a willingness to perform every thing which God shall require.

When persons receive things for the will of God without a suitable evidence of their being so, this discovers not so much a zeal and forwardness to do the will of God, as a laziness of temper, a most culpable indolence, a sloth highly blameworthy, which exposes them to receive the very worst things as coming from above, the dictates of Satan for the truths of God; makes them liable to be imposed upon by the cunning of designing knaves, or the madness of every enthusiast; and is a direct disobedience to the commands of God, which enjoin us to *search the scriptures, to try the spirits*, and judge of divine truths by their evidence.

On the other hand, when persons will not yield to such evidence as is convictive in all other the most important cases, and which they govern themselves by in the weightiest concerns of the present life, this discovers an obstinacy and perverseness of temper that is noways excusable: it shews also a great disinclination and averseness to perform the will of God. What reason can be assigned why they should withhold their assent in matters of reli-



gion, when they have the same evidence of the truth thereof as they are forced to yield to, and are governed by, in all other the most important affairs, unless it be their aversion to perform what God requires? If God has been pleased to give us as strong proof that the things enjoined in the gospel are his will, as we are contented with, and act upon, in all the most momentous concerns of the present life; what can hinder us from embracing the gospel precepts as containing the mind of God, and conforming thereto in our lives, but a disinclination to their purity and holiness, and a fondness for the contrary vices? Men are loath to part with their endeared habits. To cut off a right hand, and pluck out a right eye, is matter of pains and difficulty. They cannot find in their hearts to root up their beloved lusts and long-indulged vices. Therefore they resist the very same evidence they yield to in all other cases, at least so far as not to be influenced and governed by it in their conversations.

Forasmuch then as the admitting things to be the mind of God without proper evidence is directly disobeying the command of God, and betrays a most culpable indolence and sloth; and again, the rejecting things as divine, when supported by the same evidence which is convictive to us in all other the most important cases, betrays an unreasonable stubbornness of temper, and an aversion to the things required of us; the middle way is unquestionably the safest, and the only commendable one; which is, to look into and examine the proofs of those things which are offered to us as containing the will of God, and always to yield to such arguments as we have nothing solid to object against; to give our

assent to, and act by such evidence as usually governs us in all the momentous affairs of the present life. This discovers a studious desire in us of knowing what the will of God is, and a readiness to acknowledge and obey it.

And should we err in following this rule, which I cannot but think the goodness of God will secure us from, we are undoubtedly safe with respect to the favour of God, because such error would, in the present condition of human nature, be utterly unavoidable: by this method therefore we cannot fail of pleasing God. By seeking after proper evidence, we shew our great unwillingness to be deceived, and to take that for his will which is not so: and by yielding to the same evidence, which we are forced to assent to and govern ourselves by, in the greatest business and concerns of life, we shew our desire to please him, and readiness to obey him.

Thus have I considered the commendation given to the grace of faith in my text, and laid before you the reason of it. I have already observed, that the faith the apostle here speaks of is such a belief of gospel truths as begets love in the heart and obedience in the life. This is the faith he commends: for it is noways commendable that a person barely assent to the truths of the gospel upon the evidence we have been mentioning, unless he also act accordingly, unless he govern his temper and direct his behaviour agreeably to the gospel precepts. This is it that renders faith in an unseen Saviour so praiseworthy, that we be not only inwardly convinced, but demonstrate that we are so in our outward conduct, by conforming ourselves to Christ's example, and obeying his commands.

And this is the only way to attain the joy so highly commended by the apostle in the words following: *In whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory*, or of praise. Would you maintain a serenity of mind and joy of heart in all states of life, and under the near prospect of death? would you be able to rejoice in the midst of calamities, and under the severest trials and afflictions? would you triumph even in the agonies of a violent and lingering death, as many of the holy martyrs have done? you must not only give your assent to the truths of the gospel, but must subject yourselves to Christ's government, and perform his will. Unless you produce the fruit of a good life, your faith is dead, your hope is presumption, and all your joy is deceit. If you would lead a life of comfort and joy, you must lead a life of faith. The life you henceforth lead, *you must live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved you, and gave himself for you. The love of Christ must constrain you, that you live no longer to yourselves, but to him that died for you, and rose again from the dead.* And if you have such a faith as this, how reasonable is your joy! your sins are pardoned; you are the children of God, and heirs of glory; *joint heirs with Christ to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away.* You may firmly depend on your heavenly Father for whatever aids, supports, and comfort you need here, and rejoice in the hope of everlasting glory and unspeakable bliss hereafter.

THE

INTRODUCTION AND SCHEME.

---

WE no sooner come to years of understanding and reflection than we feel one of those truths, which (if we have had any tolerable education) have from our infancy been inculcated on us, striking us in the strongest manner; and that is, that religion is an affair of the highest moment, of the utmost consequence to us possible. This truth shines with so overbearing a light, that persons must first deny the existence of religion itself before they can doubt, dispute of, or diminish its importance. Accordingly we find, when we arrive at knowledge and experience in the world, that it is a truth universally allowed by those who acknowledge the immortality of the soul; or a future state of rewards and punishments, even though they deny all revelation.

It is too plainly visible that mankind are not agreed in an affair of this avowed concern. Even those who are united in the acknowledgment of its moment and consequence, differ widely in their notions of the thing itself: and it cannot be concealed from us, that some parts of the world are not more remotely distant from others in their situations, habits, and languages, than in their religious tenets. Ought not every man then to examine whether the religion he professes be well founded, built upon

such solid grounds as will not deceive him? The more necessary, useful, and important the edifice, the greater should be the care taken that the foundation be sure and immoveable.

Shall a man grudge his pains, and spare himself the thought and study, to be satisfied of the truth of the religion he professes? Can he be too solicitous, too diligent, in an affair of the utmost consequence? No, certainly; his labour and fatigue in the inquiry ought to bear some proportion to the great moment of the truth he is seeking; till he is firmly persuaded that he has the justest reason to give his assent to it, and is fully determined to be governed by it. For should we be never so strongly convinced of the truth of religion, but at the same time will not form our lives agreeably thereto, we might as well have omitted the pains we were at in examining its evidence, and confirming ourselves in the belief of it, because it cannot be of any service to us to see our way to happiness, if we refuse to walk in it.

Forasmuch as the religion we have been educated in is that delivered down to us by Christ and his disciples as revealed from heaven, it is our concern most certainly well to consider and duly to weigh its pretensions; that if the proofs there are for its being true and genuine are substantial, and carry conviction with them, we may with all cheerfulness perform the things thereby enjoined, and with pleasure wait for the glory and felicity therein promised.

The first thing that offers itself to our thoughts, in the trial of a revelation pretending to come from above, is, whether it be worthy of God, and suited to the condition of man. If it teaches doctrines con-



tradictory to the nature of God, or to that reason with which he has endued us; if it recommends examples or enjoins precepts inconsistent with the moral attributes of the divine Being, or the eternal rule of right reason; if it insist on the practice of such things as tend manifestly to the hurt and detriment of man, and to the preventing his happiness; we may justly and warrantably conclude that it is not from heaven. But the more fully we examine, and the more thoroughly we comprehend the Christian scheme, the more firmly shall we be persuaded that it was fitting to be revealed by God, and received by men; that every part of it exactly harmonizes with the divine attributes, and is no less agreeable to the state of man; that it has a plain and direct tendency to improve and meliorate his condition here, and thereby train him up and prepare him for that perfection it gives him hope of hereafter; that there is not the least thing required of us, but what it was highly becoming the wisdom of God to insist on, and manifestly conducive to our interest and welfare to comply with.

The next inquiry that occurs naturally to our minds is, whether this revelation be fact. It is very possible that, after the strictest scrutiny we are capable of making, we may be able to discern nothing in a revelation pretending to come from God unworthy of him, or unsuitable to the state of man; at least there may be so plausible an interpretation put upon those things we object to, as we cannot reasonably find fault with. And yet, after all, this may be no other than the invention of men, the well-laid contrivance of some crafty, political heads, who, studiously considering and foreseeing the ob-

jections that might be started, industriously prevented them.

It is not enough therefore to see that the Christian religion is every way becoming the wisdom and nature of God, and highly conducive to the perfection and happiness of man, unless we can also satisfy ourselves of the truth of the fact that it was indeed revealed from heaven. And I doubt not to assert it as a thing certain from manifold experience, that the more fully persons inquire into the evidence of this fact, the more nicely they sift, and the more scrupulously and minutely they examine its several proofs, the more substantial and convincing will they always find them.

Another thing that will present itself to the inquiry of a considerate and knowing mind, as necessary to be canvassed, is, whether this revelation has not been superseded by a later. The Jews affirm that theirs is the only religion revealed from heaven. Christians acknowledge the truth of their revelation; but at the same time allege that far the greater part of the things therein enjoined are set aside by the new revelation made to them. Is there no one of a yet more modern date to which the Christian ought to yield? A very large part of the world make pretences to such a revelation, and would obtrude the Koran upon us, as what ought to take place in the room of our gospel. But the more impartially we examine the contents of that book, and the methods by which a professed belief of it has been enforced and propagated, so much the less proofs shall we find of its being a divine revelation. If war, bloodshed, slaughter, and desolation, carried on for no end but the making converts and

proselytes, can be evidence of the truth of a religion ; if the drawn sword, pointed at a man's breast, can be a natural and proper means to convince his mind, divest him of his errors, and shew him the truth ; then may we entertain favourable sentiments of Mohammed and his religion. But if these are methods repugnant to nature and truth ; if these terrify and confound, but not instruct men ; if they darken the mind, instead of enlightening it ; if they make men hypocritically profess what they neither do nor can believe ; then may we firmly persuade ourselves that the Christian revelation still continues in its full force, and that the pretences of the Musselmen are all groundless.

To go through each of these three inquiries in so full and distinct a manner as a subject of this nature ought to be treated, and to answer all the objections that have been raised, would take up much more time than the honourable founder has allotted to any one person in the preaching of this Lecture. I shall confine myself therefore to the second inquiry, and lay before you those proofs which convince me that the Christian religion is in fact a divine revelation.

No one, I think, pretends to deny that Christianity has been now openly and publicly professed for 1700 years and upwards ; and were it denied, it is the easiest thing imaginable to shew it by turning to the histories of every age during that period. How great a part of the world professed this religion when Constantine the Roman emperor became a Christian, no one who has looked into the accounts of his life and times can be ignorant. How very numerous the Christians were in the province of

Bithynia, in the reign of the emperor Trajan, Pliny is an undeniable witness. Suetonius and Tacitus inform us with what severity the followers of Christ were treated before this under Nero. But if we ascend a little higher, and consult the histories of Julius Cæsar, or his successor Augustus, or of any princes contemporary with or elder than them, we find not a word of any such religion, or of the persons who professed it. Hence is it most evident, that the relation given us in our sacred books of the rise of Christianity exactly corresponds with what we are able to gather concerning it from other authors; and it is plainly demonstrable from heathen writers, that the time fixed by the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, for its first appearance and progress in the world, is the very time in which it began, and no other.

As the five books I have now mentioned are the only genuine sacred books which give us a clear, distinct, historical account of the original success of the Christian religion, so the wonderful facts related therein must, I think, be readily acknowledged by all to be in themselves the most likely means to spread and propagate it: and it is very difficult, if not impossible, to conceive how it should in so short a time gain the ground it did, if these facts had not been true. If indeed we take them for granted, that is, if there were prophecies delivered to the Jewish nation many ages before concerning the Messiah who was to come; if these all centered in and described the blessed Jesus; if there were various miraculous appearances preceding and attending his birth; if he had open and express attestations from heaven of the truth of his mission; if he healed the

sick, cleansed the leprous, gave sight to the blind, cured the paralytic, and this at a word's speaking, and sometimes at a distance; if he raised to life those who had been some time dead; if, according to his own prediction, he arose himself from the dead on the third day; if he foretold several things as difficult to be foreseen as this, and which exactly answered in the event; if his disciples after him did more and greater miracles than he himself had done; if they wrought these wonderful works, not for the space of one or two years only, but upwards of thirty years together, not in small villages, but the greatest and most populous cities; if the whole Jewish nation, and multitudes that came from all countries to Jerusalem, were witnesses of these things; if they performed them not in Judæa only, but in every even the most distant parts of the world, whither they went to preach the gospel; if these facts, I say, are taken for granted by us, it is no difficult matter to conceive how the Christian religion should in the course of a few years be spread through the vast extent of the Roman empire, and much beyond it. But if we will not admit the truth of these facts, I think it is utterly impossible for the wit of man to invent any probable account how it came to pass that this religion was so soon and so widely propagated as we find it was.

We learn both from Jewish and heathen writers, that the Author of this religion underwent the disgrace of a public execution, due only to the vilest of malefactors: and Christians themselves have always openly professed that he suffered the painful and ignominious death of the cross. How strong a prejudice must this raise in the minds of all against



embracing it! how great an aversion to it! what an invincible obstacle must this have been to its spreading and prevailing, had not those extraordinary and miraculous means before mentioned been made use of to that end! and even those, when heard of only by a distant rumour, but not seen, not examined into, and thoroughly understood, might give persons no very agreeable idea of the Christian religion, being represented by its enemies as the effects of sorcery. Hence it was, I am persuaded, that Tacitus and Suetonius were led to pass the harsh censures<sup>a</sup> they do upon this religion and its professors. It was natural for persons, who would not give themselves the trouble to sift this affair to the bottom, to conclude that a Roman governor would not have condemned Christ to so cruel a death, had he not been a criminal that highly deserved it; and to take it for granted, that all who could list themselves under such a wretch as their teacher and master, must be as wicked as himself; and that none but the worst of mankind could deify and worship one who had been deservedly punished with the death of the vilest slave. It is possible they might also think that nothing but an invincible love to the wicked, detestable arts of sorcery, which he had taught them, could induce them to adhere to him. Is it any wonder that persons who took up with opinions so injurious, so foreign from the truth, should speak ill of Christians and their religion? This, however, may convince us what prejudices prevailed, and that nothing but the most glaring evidence of the con-

<sup>a</sup> *Exitibilis superstitio*, Tac. *Superstitionis maleficæ*, Suet. Epithets very usually affixed to the magical arts.

trary truths could have dispelled and removed them.

We learn also from the two forementioned heathen writers that Christians not only underwent an ill fame, but were severely handled; that as early as Nero's reign they suffered a most bitter persecution. Tacitus informs us that a great multitude of them were apprehended by that emperor's order, and exposed to the most cruel tortures, the most painful and lingering deaths. Now that persons should vanquish the deep-rooted prejudices they had sucked in with their milk, abandon the religion they were educated in, and, notwithstanding the utter aversion they might some time have felt in themselves to the doing it, become the disciples, adorers, and worshippers of one whom far the most about them looked upon as no other than a criminal justly condemned and deservedly executed, and thereby lay themselves open to the scorn, contempt, ridicule, hatred, and ill treatment of their kindred, acquaintance, and neighbours; renounce all their hopes and interests in this world; run the risk of every thing that was dear and valuable to them here; hazard life itself, and dare venture upon death under its most ghastly form, dying piece-meal and by inches; I say, that a great multitude should do this upon less grounds than those related in the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, seems to me wholly incredible.

I know not that any who have yet written on the infidel side of the question have attempted to give us a reasonable account of this matter. Till they are pleased therefore to lay before us at least a plausible method in which so great and sudden a

change might be brought to pass, we may, I think, safely continue in the persuasion that it was by the wonders related in our holy books; and may take leave also to say, that although they cannot, as they pretend, bring themselves to believe the historical facts contained in the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, yet they can easily give credit to that which it is far more difficult to conceive; that is, that the Christian religion could be spread through so many widely distant nations, as we find it was in the course of a very few years, notwithstanding the aversion and inveterate prejudices of those who were to embrace it; notwithstanding the violent opposition that was made to it by the powers of the world; notwithstanding the contempt, ridicule, and sufferings the professors of it underwent from their friends and neighbours, without any of the miraculous means mentioned in our sacred writings, and by the ordinary course of human affairs.

It has been often observed, that although infidels accuse Christians of an easy credulity, the accusation, when retorted, is just; that they themselves, in truth, are the easy and credulous, and embrace the most monstrous absurdities in maintenance of their infidelity. What I have just now laid before you is manifestly one instance: they will not believe the wonderful facts related in the Gospels and the history of the Acts; and yet they believe what is far more incredible, that is, that the Christian religion was propagated without them. When once they attempt to shew us how this could be, I think it is very evident that they will expose the nakedness of their cause, and their absurdity must appear to all.

If the matters of fact contained in these historical relations be admitted as true, it can be longer doubted whether the Christian religion be a divine revelation. If there were so many miraculous appearances at the birth of Jesus; if during his life he performed such amazing works; if after his death he arose from the grave, ascended visibly into heaven, sent down the gifts of the Holy Spirit on his disciples; according to his promise, endued them with such wonderful power, and enabled them to testify the truth of his resurrection with all boldness, notwithstanding the hazard they ran, and the ill treatment they met with for so doing, as is particularly related therein; no one, that allows himself at all to think, can make the least doubt that he is the Messiah, the Son of God, as he declared himself to be, and that the doctrine he taught he received from his Father. For as it is certain that such things could not be brought to pass without the divine permission, so no one can conceive it reconcileable with the attributes of an infinitely holy, just, true, and good Being to have suffered such things to be done, in order to impose on and deceive the best of men in an affair of the highest consequence to them possible. For Jesus openly appealed to his miraculous works, and particularly his resurrection from the dead, as the proof of his being sent from heaven. Was it consistent with the holiness, justice, truth, and goodness of God, to allow these proofs to follow his appeal, if he had not sent him? If we admit a Providence ruling over all, we must be persuaded, that, in a case of such importance, it would have interposed, and prevented the imposture. For who were the persons the most likely to be deceived?

were they not those who were the best disposed, who entertained the highest regard for the Deity; were the most desirous of knowing his will, and the most willing to obey it? and could there be any thing concern them more nearly, or of greater consequence to them, than the things which relate to the worship and favour of God, and a future life? Unless therefore we can suppose that the infinitely perfect Being could act an unkind and unfriendly part by those who were most devoted to his service, we can never grant that he would suffer the dead to be raised to life, in proof that certain doctrines regarding his worship and a future life were revealed by him, which were not so.

This being a consequence generally seen, and readily assented to, the authority of our sacred books, and the truth of the facts contained in them, have of late been disputed. I shall endeavour therefore to lay before you the plain proofs we have of their being true and genuine histories, and answer all the arguments which I can learn have been made use of to weaken their authority, and render the facts related therein doubtful. I shall begin with the Acts of the Apostles, and (if the time will give me leave) proceed afterwards to the four Gospels.

With regard to the Acts of the Apostles, I shall first give you a short view of the facts contained therein; secondly, shew you how far these facts are confirmed to us by other historians; thirdly, lay before you the plain and direct proofs there are that this book was written by St. Luke, and was owned and received by the Christians as a sacred book, and the arguments thence arising of the truth of the facts therein related; fourthly, the incontestable evi-



dence these facts afford of the truth of Christianity ; and, lastly, answer all the objections that I can find have been at any time started either with regard to the authority of this book, or to the truth of any of the facts related in it.



## CHAP. I.

*A short view of the facts contained in the history of the Acts, with some natural reflections thence arising.*

I SHALL, first of all, give you a brief view of the facts contained in this book: they are, the visible ascension of Christ into heaven; the miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost on the disciples, together with the wonderful powers thereby conferred; the healing the lame beggar, who was daily laid at the Beautiful gate of the temple; and the increase of Christ's followers, by the amazing conversion of many thousand Jews; the exemplary punishment of Ananias and Sapphira, with many miracles done by Peter and the other apostles; the imprisonment and miraculous release of the apostles; their being afterwards apprehended, and beaten by the magistrates; the appointment of seven deacons; the defence of St. Stephen before the sanhedrim, and his being stoned; Philip the deacon's planting the gospel in Samaria; the gifts of the Holy Ghost being conferred by the hands of the apostles; the feigned conversion of Simon Magus, and the real conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch; Saul's bitter persecution of Christ's disciples, and his miraculous conversion; St. Peter's curing Æneas of an eight years' palsy, and raising Dorcas from the dead; his being taught by a vision from heaven that the Gentiles were to be no longer esteemed unclean; his preaching the gospel to Cornelius and his friends, and the

Holy Ghost's falling on them ; the plentiful crop of Gentile converts after this, particularly at Antioch ; the prophecy of Agabus concerning the dearth there should be under Claudius Cæsar ; Herod's slaying the apostle James with the sword ; his imprisoning of Peter, who is delivered by an angel, and his remarkable end ; that Paul and Barnabas, commissioned by the Holy Ghost to publish the gospel among the Gentiles, arrive at Salamis, preach to Sergius Paulus the Roman governor, are opposed by Elymas the sorcerer, who is struck blind, and the governor is converted ; that they next preached the word at Antioch in Pisidia, first to the Jews, and then to the Gentiles, and among the latter had a large number of converts ; but, being persecuted by the envious Jews, they travelled to Iconium, and so spake there, that a great multitude both of Jews and Gentiles believed ; that they abode here a long time, and did many miracles ; but at length, being persecuted by the envy of the Jews, they fled to Lycaonia, and St. Paul having healed a cripple, lame from his mother's womb, at Lystra, the inhabitants would fain have done him divine honours, taking him for a god ; the Jews here also stirred up the people against St. Paul, and prevailed to that degree, that they stoned him, drew him out of the city, and left him for dead ; but the almighty arm saved him, so that either he received no hurt from the force and weight of the stones thrown at him, or his bruises and wounds were immediately healed ; for he soon arose, and, after the short stay of one night more in that city, went the next day with Barnabas to Derbe, and having taught many there, they returned to Lystra, to Iconium, to Antioch in

Pisidia, and having ordained elders in every church which they had planted, they passed throughout Pisidia, came to Pamphylia, preached at Perga, went down to Attalia, and then returned to Antioch in Syria, from whence they set out: that Paul and Barnabas were sent from hence to Jerusalem to consult the apostles whether it were necessary that the converted Gentiles should be circumcised, and declared before them and the whole multitude of the disciples at Jerusalem what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them; and the apostles with the elders having determined this question in favour of the Gentile converts, Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch: that after some days Paul and Barnabas, purposing to visit the churches they had planted among the Gentiles, differed so greatly in their opinions concerning John, whose surname was Mark, that, they separating, Barnabas went to Cyprus, and Paul, passing through Syria and Cilicia, went to Derbe and Lystra; as he went through the cities, delivering the decrees of the apostles to keep, and establishing the churches in their faith: and having gone throughout Phrygia and Galatia, he came down to Troas; from whence, being warned by a vision, he went to Samothracia, the next day to Neapolis, and from thence to Philippi, which was the first city of that part of Macedonia, and a Roman colony: here he converted Lydia, cast the demon out of the Pythonissa, was scourged, cast into prison, and had his feet fastened in the stocks; but at midnight the prison-doors being flung open by a miraculous earthquake, and the irons of every prisoner falling off, the gaoler, concluding they were all fled, in the greatness of



his surprise would have stabbed himself, had not Paul assured him that not one prisoner was missing : overcome by this wonderful event, he gave attention to the word preached by Paul and Silas, and was baptized, he and all his household : the magistrates of this city, repenting of their rash act in beating and imprisoning two Romans unheard, uncondemned, came the next day, and besought them to leave both the prison and their city : that St. Paul went from thence through Amphipolis and Apollonia, and came to Thessalonica, where, after having converted many to the Christian faith, an uproar being made by the unbelieving Jews, he went unto Berœa ; whence, after a large harvest of converts, the Jews stirring up the people against him here also, he was conducted to Athens : having preached and made a few converts in that city, he went to Corinth ; there he abode about two years, and converted very many. He was here carried before Gallio the Roman proconsul, and Sosthenes the chief ruler of the synagogue was beaten for his sake. He sailed from Cenchrea, the eastern port belonging to Corinth, for Syria, put in by the way at Ephesus, and, after a short stay in that city, sailed thence to Cæsarea ; and having gone up and saluted the church at Jerusalem, he went down to Antioch in Syria. That after some time spent here, he went again over all the countries of Galatia and Phrygia, comforting the disciples ; and, passing through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus. Here he conferred the Holy Ghost on twelve disciples, who before this had heard only of John's baptism. He continued in this city three months preaching in the synagogue of the Jews, and after that disputed daily in the

school of one Tyrannus by the space of two years, so that all who dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Gentiles: and God wrought special miracles by the hand of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them. Seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, attempting to cast out an evil spirit by the name of Jesus, in imitation of the apostle, were forced to flee out of the house wounded and naked. Many that used magic arts and sorceries, being converted, confessed and renounced their evil deeds, and burnt their books. An uproar was raised against St. Paul by Demetrius the silversmith, and artfully appeased by the town-clerk; after which St. Paul immediately left this city, and went through Macedonia into Greece. There he continued three months, and learning that the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to sail into Syria, he returned to Macedonia, and sailed from Philippi to Troas. Here Paul raised Eutychus to life, who had fallen from a third story to the ground, and was taken up dead. Thence he went to Assos, and Mitylene, and Samos, and Trogyllium, and Miletus. To this place he sent for the elders of Ephesus, and in a most pathetic discourse foretold the disorders that would happen among them after his departure. Thence he went to Coos, and Rhodes, and Patara, where he took ship for Phœnicia, and landed at Tyre. Here he met with disciples, who foresaw the danger he would be exposed to by going up to Jerusalem, and dissuaded him from it. He sailed thence to Ptolemais, and went to Cæsarea, where continuing in the

house of Philip the deacon and evangelist many days, there came Agabus the prophet down from Judæa, and foretold that Paul should be bound at Jerusalem, and delivered into the hands of the Gentiles. Notwithstanding, being willing to lay down his life for the name of Jesus, he went up to Jerusalem; and certain Asiatic Jews, finding him in the temple, raised a tumult, and would have put him to death, had he not been rescued out of their hands by Claudius Lysias, the chief captain, with his Roman soldiers, who imprisoned him, and would have put him to the question by scourging, but that he found he was a citizen of Rome. The chief captain, willing to know his crime, ordered him a hearing before the Jewish sanhedrim; and being informed that if he brought him a second time before them he would be murdered by certain Jews, who had bound themselves under a great curse to that purpose, he sent him with a strong guard to Felix the Roman governor, residing at Cæsarea. St. Paul had a hearing before Felix; and although the Roman governor was convinced of his innocence, yet, through covetousness and fear of the Jews, he would not release him, but left him in prison when he was recalled from the province. Porcius Festus succeeded him, and soon after his arrival gave a hearing to Paul; who, finding that the Jews had prevailed with the governor to carry him to Jerusalem, in order to be tried there, and knowing of their lying in wait to kill him by the way, appealed unto Cæsar. He is again heard by Festus, in the presence of king Agrippa and his sister Bernice, and his innocence acknowledged by all. Being committed to Julius the centurion, and sent to Rome, in conse-

quence of his appeal, the ship which carries them touches at Sidon, and thence goes to Myra in Lycia, where the centurion taking passage in another ship bound for Italy, they sail to the Fair Havens in the island of Crete. Here St. Paul foretold the great damage and risk that would befall them, if they continued their voyage, which they notwithstanding did, in order to obtain a more commodious port to winter in; and when in the utmost danger, and they had given over all hope of life, he encouraged them, by foretelling that they should all escape safe to land, which accordingly happened in the island of Malta. Here St. Paul was bitten by a serpent, and not hurt; healed the father of Publius, the chief man of the island, of a fever and bloody flux, and others also who had diseases; and after a stay of three months was put on board a ship of Alexandria, which went first to Syracuse, thence to Rhegium, thence to Puteoli, from which place he went by land to Appii Forum, the Three Taverns, and so to Rome, and lived there two years, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ.

This is a relation of things which happened for the space of about thirty years after our Saviour's death. Very many and very wonderful, you see, are the events here recorded; not said to have fallen out in an obscure corner of the earth, where few could have opportunity to inquire into and fully know the truth; but in a great variety of countries and cities, not only the most populous, but the most polite. Had this history been forged, it was the most impolitic thing imaginable to lay the scene so wide, to include so long a space of time, and men-

tion so many persons by name. This was the certain way to lay open the forgery to the conviction of all mankind, and prevent its deceiving of any one person. If it were written with an intention to impose on the world, is it possible to conceive how the author could have taken a more effectual method to frustrate his own end? None sure but a fool or a madman could have formed such a scheme; and it is utterly impossible, in the nature of the thing, that it could have met with success. To render himself accountable for the truth of so great a variety of facts, in such distant parts of the world, and to make the whole credit of Christianity, the advancement of which is the only end he has in view, to depend upon the certainty of every one of these facts, does by no means bespeak the cunning of an artful impostor. If we read the Koran, we see little history in it; that little is of ancient times long passed, and therefore not easy to be contradicted; none at all, I think, of the times in or near which the book itself was written: and undoubtedly the fewer facts are mentioned, and the less explicit the narration, as to the circumstances of time and place, and the names of the persons concerned, so much the less liable must it necessarily be to contradiction. But to write a history of the time then immediately passed, in which are named many persons of the highest rank and distinction, in which many large countries of a vast extent are travelled over, and about fifty different cities are visited, among them some of the greatest note the world ever had, such as Jerusalem, Ephesus, Corinth, Athens, Rome, and in which history are recorded the most surprising events that ever came to pass, could never be



the way to impose on and deceive mankind, because the things asserted lay fairly open to examination ; and it was the easiest matter in the world to have confuted them, had they not been notorious truths. Besides, it is well known, that the time when these facts are said to have happened, and when this history was written, was not in any of the darkest and most ignorant ages ; but in an inquisitive and knowing age, an age of great discernment and letters, when learning was now arrived at its highest pitch, and there was a free communication between most countries, a great part of the world being subject to the Roman empire, so that intelligence was easy to be had from all the cities and places herein mentioned, and the truth of things could not be concealed.

Had we all the records and histories of that time now extant, I am persuaded we should see an abundant confirmation of every particular contained in the book of Acts. But as they are well nigh all lost, through the length and accidents of time, nothing further is left, after having deplored this our unhappiness, than that we be the more diligent in examining the very few which remain. I proceed therefore now to the second thing proposed, which is to shew you how far the facts contained in the Acts of the Apostles are confirmed to us by other writers : and that I may reduce what I have to say under this head into some method, I shall first take notice of the ordinary occurrences of that time which are herein hinted or related, and the great personages named ; secondly, the several distinctions among the Jews that are here mentioned ; thirdly,

### 36 REFLECTIONS ON THINGS RELATED.

the customs and manners of that time, whether Jewish, Grecian, or Roman, that are here referred to; fourthly, the places here spoken of; and, fifthly, the extraordinary and miraculous events recorded.

## CHAP. II.

*What is written in the history of the Acts of the ordinary occurrences of that time, and of the great persons therein named, confirmed from other authors.*

FIRST, I shall compare what is here said of the ordinary occurrences of the time, and of the great personages named, with what is reported in other authors. The time we are speaking of is from the nineteenth of the reign of Tiberius to the ninth of the reign of Nero, from the 3982d year of the world to the 4012th, from the 785th of the building of Rome to the 815th, from the 33d of the vulgar Christian era to the 63d.

In this time were four Roman emperors, who reigned successively, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, and Nero. There is no mention made of any of these by name in the Acts of the Apostles excepting Claudius Cæsar<sup>a</sup>. The Cæsar to whom St. Paul appealed<sup>b</sup> was Nero. During the first seven years of this period Judæa was a Roman province<sup>c</sup>, and had a governor among them sent by the Romans: then it was made a kingdom again, and subject to Herod Agrippa<sup>d</sup>: three years after, upon the death of Agrippa, it was turned into a province again<sup>e</sup>,

<sup>a</sup> Acts xi. 28.

<sup>b</sup> Acts xxv. 11.

<sup>c</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 18. c. 5. §. 2. et c. 7. §. 10. et l. 19. c. 2. §. 5. pr. et c. 5. §. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Antiq. l. 19. c. 5. §. 1. et de Bel. l. 2. c. 11. §. 5.

<sup>e</sup> Antiq. l. 19. c. 8. §. 2. et c. 9. §. 2. et de Bell. l. 2. c. 11. §. 6. Tacit. Hist. 5. 9.

and of the number of governors sent thither were both Felix and Festus : that our Saviour was crucified under the government of Pontius Pilate Tacitus is witness<sup>f</sup>. And although he continued governor some years after, there was no occasion to make mention of him in the history of the Acts. The first person who is there spoken of as invested with supreme authority over the Jewish nation is Herod the king, that is, Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great by his son Aristobulus, who was made king of Judæa, Samaria, and Cæsarea, by Claudius Cæsar<sup>g</sup>. It is said of him in the book of Acts, that *being at Cæsarea, upon a set day, he, arrayed in royal apparel, sat upon his throne, and made an oration to them. And the people gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man. And immediately the angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost*<sup>h</sup>. The account which Josephus gives us of this king's death agrees most remarkably herewith. He relates of him, "that he went to Cæsarea, and that there, "upon a feast day, (which had been instituted in "honour of Cæsar, and to which feast came a great "concourse of his nobles and principal officers,) he "went to the theatre, arrayed with a most splendid "vestment, made all of silver; that his flatterers "gave a shout from several parts of the surrounding "crowd, calling him God, and praying him to be "propitious to them: that he was so far from rebuking, that he indeed received this impious flat-

<sup>f</sup> Annal. l. 15. 44.      <sup>g</sup> Antiq. l. 19. c. 8. §. 2. prope fin.

<sup>h</sup> Acts xii. 19, 21, 22, 23.

“ tery : and that immediately before he left the assembly, he was smitten with most exquisite pain in his bowels, which, continuing five days, finished his life<sup>i</sup>.” It is a thing, I doubt not, must occur to most readers, and therefore scarce deserves the remarking, that it is usual for those who are eaten of worms, to be attacked with a most exquisite pain in their bowels. Thus was it with Antiochus Epiphanes ; *A pain of the bowels, that was remediless, came upon him, and sore torments of the inner parts<sup>k</sup>*, and soon after it is related of him, *that worms rose up out of his body<sup>l</sup>*. Thus also was it with Herod the Great, who was this king’s grandfather. Josephus, in describing his distemper, says, “ that he had ulcers and severe pains in his bowels :” and a little after, “ that he bred worms<sup>m</sup>.” The same was the case of the emperor Maximianus Galerius : for though Eusebius expresses not the pain, yet such is his description of the disease as evidently shews he must have been full of torture in his bowels<sup>n</sup>. It has been made a question, (and what is there so plain that some learned men will not dispute ?) whether the Herod mentioned in the twelfth chapter of the Acts, and the Agrippa of Josephus, were the same person, because of the difference of

<sup>i</sup> Antiq. l. 19. c. 8. §. 2. ‘Ο δὲ δῆμος ἐπεφάνει· Θεοῦ φωνή, Acts xii. 22. Εἰθὺς δὲ οἱ κόλακες τὰς — ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν φωνὰς ἀνεβόων, Θεὸν προσαγορεύοντες. Jos. loco citato.

<sup>k</sup> 2 Maccab. ix. 5.

<sup>l</sup> 2 Maccab. ix. 9.

<sup>m</sup> Antiq. l. 17. c. 6. §. 5. pr. et de Bell. l. 1. c. 33. §. 5.

<sup>n</sup> Ἀθρόα μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὰ μέσα τῶν ἀποβήτων τοῦ σώματος, ἀπόστασις γίγνεται αὐτῷ· εἴθ’ ἕλκος ἐν βάθει συριγγῶδες, καὶ τούτων ἀνίατος νομὴ κατὰ τῶν ἐνδοτάτῃ σπλάγχχναν ἀφ’ ὧν ἀλεκτόν τι πλῆθος σκολήκων βρύνειν. Hist. l. 8. c. 16. et Vit. Con. l. 1. c. 57.



names<sup>o</sup>? but certainly, when the time and place of reigning, and circumstances of death, so exactly agree, the difference of name is of small importance, especially when it was no uncommon thing among the Jews to have two names: and it is no unreasonable thing to suppose that Agrippa, if he had not the name of Herod before, should take it upon him, when he was put in possession of all the dominions of his grandfather Herod the Great<sup>p</sup>, whose grandeur and munificence he very much affected. Archelaus, who succeeded his father Herod in part only of his dominions, seems to have taken upon himself the same name: for he is expressly called Herod by Dio<sup>q</sup>. The Syriac translation of the New Testament, which is very ancient, and approaches near to the times of the apostles themselves<sup>r</sup>, puts this matter out of all doubt: for there the reading of Acts xii. 1. is thus; *Herod the king, who is surnamed Agrippa*: and in this reading all the MS. copies of that translation agree. I may add, that in the opinion of several learned men, well skilled in affairs of this nature, there are coins of this king now extant bearing the name of Herod<sup>s</sup>. Josephus, who wrote his history for the use of foreigners, very properly mentions him always by his Roman name,

<sup>o</sup> Particularly by Father Harduin.

<sup>p</sup> Jos. de Bell. l. 2. c. 11. §. 5.

<sup>q</sup> L. 55. p. 567. And it is the opinion of Noldius, that Agrippa junior, the son of this king, was also called Herod, from a passage in the Talmud Sanhed. cap. Chelech. Vid. Hist. Idum. p. 390.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Father Simon's Crit. t. 2. c. 13.

<sup>s</sup> Such as Spanheim, Cellarius, and Basnage. Vid. Cell. Dissert. Acad. p. 219. et Basn. Ann. p. 540.

the name by which he was so long and well known in the city of Rome. St. Luke, who has occasion to speak only of a few actions of his while reigning in Judæa, as properly calls him by his Syriac name, the name which in all probability he most affected in his own country and dominions.

§. 2. When this king died, Judæa being again made a province, after some others Felix was sent thither as governor by the emperor Claudius<sup>t</sup>. St. Paul, in his defence before this governor, says, *Forasmuch as I know, that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation*<sup>u</sup>. The learned bishop Pearson thinks that he had been now governor five years and a half only: and this, when compared with the time of his three immediate predecessors, Cuspius Fadus, Tiberius Alexander, and Cumanus, might be well said to be *many years*, it being near as long again as the time allotted to each of them: for the government of all these three together could not last much above eight years and a half at the furthest. But, for any reasons that I have yet seen advanced by learned men to the contrary, Felix might have been at this time procurator of Judæa between seven and eight years. Josephus does not so precisely fix the time of his being appointed governor as that there should remain no doubt. It is true, after he has said, “And Claudius sends Felix “the brother of Pallas to preside over the affairs of “Judæa,” he immediately adds, “and having now “completed the twelfth year of his reign, he gives “to Agrippa the tetrarchy of Philip and Batanea<sup>x</sup>.”

<sup>t</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 20. c. 6. Tacit. Ann. l. 12. 54. Hist. 5. 9. Suet. Claud. c. 28. 2. 9.

<sup>u</sup> Acts xxiv. 10.      <sup>x</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 6. §. 1.

The thing in question is, whether we must understand the first part of this last sentence to look back to what he had before related; as if he should have said, “While these affairs were transacting, Claudius finished the twelfth year of his reign, and “then gave Agrippa the tetrarchy;” or whether we must understand it as the beginning of a new relation; “And when Claudius had now completed his “twelfth year he gives Agrippa the tetrarchy.” It is plain Eusebius interpreted it in this latter sense; for he places the beginning of Felix’s government in the eleventh year of the reign of Claudius<sup>y</sup>. The same reasons also which the learned bishop Pearson gives why Felix might be acquitted at the intercession of his brother Pallas, in the sixth year of Nero, equally extend to the seventh, if not to the eighth of that emperor’s reign<sup>z</sup>.

<sup>y</sup> In Chron.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Annal. Paulin. p. 17. The learned archbishop Usher says, in his Annals, that Felix was at this time in the tenth year of his government. He takes it for granted that the province was divided between Cumanus and Felix, as reported by Tacitus, Annal. l. 12. 54. But as Josephus says not one word of this division, and plainly relates that the whole province was under each of these successively, there is no great stress to be laid on the words of Tacitus. Josephus tells us that Claudius reigned thirteen years, eight months, and twenty days. Let us suppose that Felix came into his government in the beginning of his twelfth year, in the second or third month of that year, and that St. Paul appeared before Felix in the fifth of Nero, that is, after he had reigned four years and nine months; this makes seven years and four months. Two years after this, Felix went to Rome, and found Burrhus and Pallas both living. Jos. Antiq. l. 20. c. 6. §. 9. And this he might well do, it being now but the seventh of Nero, and they were not put to death till the ninth of Nero. C. Marius Celsus and L. Asinius Gallus being consuls. Tac. Ann.

It is related of this Felix in the book of Acts, that he had a wife whose name was Drusilla, *which was a Jewess*<sup>a</sup>. Josephus gives us a particular account of this matter: he says, that Drusilla, daughter of Herod Agrippa, king of Judæa, and sister of Agrippa junior, was by her brother placed in marriage to Azizus, king of the Emesenes, who consented to be circumcised that he might obtain her: that Felix, when procurator of Judæa, having seen her, was greatly taken with her beauty; and sending a friend of his, named Simon, who was a Jew, and took upon him to be a magician, persuaded her to leave her husband, and be married to him, promising to make her a happy woman, if she did not reject him: and that she, in order to avoid the envy of her sister Bernice, who had done her no little injury upon the account of her beauty, was prevailed with to break through the Jewish laws, and be married to Felix<sup>b</sup>. It is true, Tacitus the Roman historian tells us that this Felix was married to Drusilla the granddaughter of Cleopatra and Antony<sup>c</sup>. But this is noways inconsistent with what Josephus relates: for Suetonius informs us that he was the husband of three queens<sup>d</sup>, meaning, I suppose, three kings' daughters: two of these were named Dru-

l. 14. 51. 65. Even St. Paul himself might in this case arrive at Rome in the fourth month of Nero's eighth year; the emperor Claudius dying the thirteenth day of October. Seneca ἀποκολ. Dio, p. 688. The firing of Rome, and the persecution following, did not happen till Nero's eleventh year was well advanced. Vid. Tac.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. xxiv. ver. 24.

<sup>b</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 6. §. 1, 2.

<sup>c</sup> Hist. l. 5. 9. fin.

<sup>d</sup> In Claud. 28. 2. trium reginarum maritum.

silla. She that was granddaughter to Cleopatra and Antony was daughter to Juba king of Mauritania, by their daughter Cleopatra<sup>e</sup>.

It is further said of this governor, in the history of the Acts, that *he hoped also that money should have been given him of Paul, that he might loose him; wherefore he sent for him the oftener, and communed with him*<sup>f</sup>. This well agrees with the character given him both by Josephus and Tacitus. The former relates, that “Jonathan the high priest, “who had petitioned Cæsar to send him procurator “of Judæa, lest he himself should incur the blame “of his maladministration, oftentimes admonished “him to amend his conduct in the government of “Judæa, insomuch that he became not seldom troublesome to him. For,” adds Josephus, “frequent “admonition is grievous to those who are determined to be unjust.” To get rid of the tiresome importunity of this high priest, who would have had him act a more just and upright part, he, by promising large sums of money, corrupted Doras, a most intimate friend of Jonathan, to employ ruffians to murder him, which he accordingly did<sup>g</sup>. A little after, Josephus adds, “When Porcius Festus was “sent by Nero to succeed him in the government, “the chief of the Jews inhabiting Cæsarea went up “to Rome to accuse Felix; and he had surely been “punished for his vile practices, and wicked acts of “injustice towards the Jews, had not Nero been “very indulgent to the entreaties of his brother “Pallas, who was then in high favour<sup>h</sup>.” Tacitus,

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Suet. in Calig. 26. 1. Dio, 49. 411. b. et 51. 454. a. et 459. b. c. Plut. Anton. p. 955. d. <sup>f</sup> Acts xxiv. 26.

<sup>g</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 5.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. §. 9.



in exact agreement herewith, says, “ that Felix, depending on the power his brother Pallas had at court, thought he might do all manner of wickedness with impunity<sup>i</sup>.” And in another place, “ that he exercised a despotic and absolute power in a base and servile manner, practising all sorts of cruelty and lust<sup>k</sup>.” How very proper was it to preach to such a person *of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come*<sup>l</sup>! how deeply must his conscience smite him! what just reason had he *to tremble*!

It is said in the Acts, that Porcius Festus *came into Felix's room*<sup>m</sup>. It is also expressly affirmed in the place I have but just quoted from Josephus, “ that Porcius Festus was sent by Nero to succeed Felix<sup>n</sup>.” The sacred historian adds, that then *Felix, willing to shew the Jews a pleasure, left Paul bound*<sup>o</sup>, i. e. a prisoner: and doubtless, such a governor, at the time he was obliged to deliver up his power, would gladly catch at any popular act, and readily do any thing that he thought might contribute to allay the heats raised against him, in order to prevent, if possible, the people's following him to court with their accusations. Thus Albinus, as Josephus relates, another most corrupt governor

<sup>i</sup> At non frater ejus cognomento Felix pari moderatione agebat, jam pridem Judææ impositus, et cuncta malefacta sibi impune ratus, tanta potentia subnixo. *Annal.* l. 12. c. 54.

<sup>k</sup> Per omnem sævitiam ac libidinem, jus regium servili ingenio exercuit. *Hist.* l. 5. 9.

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Acts xxiv. 25.

<sup>m</sup> Acts xxiv. 27.

<sup>n</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 9. vid. et de Bell. l. 2. c. 14. §. 1. pr.

<sup>o</sup> Acts xxiv. 27.

of Judæa<sup>p</sup>, having learnt that Géssius Florus was coming to succeed him, willing to make a show of doing some great favour to the people of Jerusalem, made a general gaol-delivery<sup>q</sup>.

§. 3. We read in the history of the Acts, that *king Agrippa and Bernice came into Cæsarea to salute Festus*<sup>r</sup>, that is, to congratulate him upon his arrival into his new government. We learn from Josephus who these persons were: he informs us, that Agrippa king of Judæa (of whom we have before spoken) left a son named Agrippa, and three daughters<sup>s</sup>: the eldest of which, named Bernice, he in his lifetime married to his own brother Herod king of Chalcis<sup>t</sup>: that the emperor Claudius did not give to young Agrippa the kingdom of Judæa upon his father's demise, because of his youth, he being then no more than seventeen years of age, but made it a Roman province<sup>u</sup>: that his uncle Herod dying four years after, the emperor made him a grant of the kingdom of Chalcis<sup>x</sup>, and four years after that bestowed on him a much larger kingdom in the lieu of Chalcis<sup>y</sup>, to which additions were made by Nero in the first year of his reign<sup>z</sup>: “that Bernice, becoming a widow by the death of  
“ Herod king of Chalcis, who was both her uncle  
“ and her husband, lived a long time in widowhood:

<sup>p</sup> See his character, de Bell. l. 2. c. 14. §. 1. Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 2. et c. 10. §. 1.

<sup>q</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 5.

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xxv. 13.

<sup>s</sup> Antiq. l. 19. c. 9. §. 1.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. c. 5. §. 1. fin.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. c. 9. §. 2. et de Bell. l. 2. c. 11. §. 6.

<sup>x</sup> L. 20. c. 4. §. 2. fin.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. c. 6. §. 1. et de Bell. l. 2. c. 12. §. 8.

<sup>z</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 4. et de Bell. l. 2. c. 13. §. 2.

“ that the report of an undue familiarity between  
 “ her and her brother prevailing, she persuaded Polemon king of Cilicia to be circumcised, and to  
 “ marry her, thinking thereby to convince the world  
 “ that the accusations spread of her were false and  
 “ slanderous: that Polemon was the more easily  
 “ prevailed with because of her riches: that the  
 “ marriage however did not continue long; but that  
 “ Bernice, through incontinence, as the fame was,  
 “ left Polemon, who, together with his marriage, bid  
 “ adieu also to the Jewish religion <sup>a</sup>.” Whether this  
 visit to Festus was made before she became Polemon’s wife cannot easily be determined. It is clear, however, that some years after this she was with her brother at Jerusalem <sup>b</sup>; and after that, in the reign of the emperor Vespasian, she went with him to Rome <sup>c</sup>; and that her character was well known in that city is fully evident from the sixth Satire of Juvenal <sup>d</sup>.

That kings who were dependent on Rome, made by the emperor, and unmade again at his pleasure, should pay great respect to all the Roman governors that were near them, is but natural to suppose. We have a remarkable instance of it in this king’s father, who being at Tiberias, five neighbouring kings made him a visit: while they were with him came

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 6. §. 3.

<sup>b</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 16. §. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Xiphilin. ex Dione, l. 66. p. 752. b.

<sup>d</sup> Ver. 155.——Adamas notissimus, et Berenices

In digito factus pretiosior. Hunc dedit olim  
 Barbarus incestæ, dedit hunc Agrippa sorori,  
 Observant ubi festa mero pede sabbatha reges,  
 Et vetus indulget senibus clementia porcis.

Vid. et Tac. Hist. l. 2. n. 2. et 81. Suet. Tit. c. 7. 2. 7. et Aurel. Vict. Epit. c. 10. 7. Vid. et Dio, l. 66. p. 753, d.

Marsus president of Syria. Josephus adds, “ that  
 “ the king, preserving the respect due to the Ro-  
 “ mans, went out of the city seven furlongs to meet  
 “ him, and that the other kings were in the coach  
 “ with him: that the concourse of so many kings  
 “ giving umbrage to the Roman governor, he sent  
 “ some of his retinue to each, enjoining them to go  
 “ home immediately <sup>e</sup>.”

King Agrippa, being informed of Paul's case by Festus, was desirous to hear him. Bernice seems also to have had the same curiosity; for she accompanied her brother to the place of hearing <sup>f</sup>. St. Paul there, addressing himself to the king, says, *I think myself happy, king Agrippa, because I shall answer for myself this day before thee, touching all the things whereof I am accused of the Jews; especially because I know thee to be expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews* <sup>g</sup>. That this king should be brought up in the knowledge of all the Jewish rites and customs, and therefore should well understand the disputes that were amongst them, is nothing more than might well be expected from the character of his father. Such was his concern for the Jewish religion, that, when the emperor Caius told him he had ordered his statue to be erected in the Temple at Jerusalem, he fainted away at the hearing it <sup>h</sup>; and, as Philo says, wrote him a long and pathetic letter, wherein, among other things, he offered him back the kingdom he had bestowed on him, and all his favours, so as that his country rites might not be

<sup>e</sup> Antiq. l. 19. c. 8. §. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Acts xxv. 22, 23.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. xxvi. 2, 3.

<sup>h</sup> Philo de Legat. p. 1030, a. b.

altered<sup>i</sup>. Josephus relates the affair thus: that after having by a rich banquet so pleased the emperor that he gave him repeated encouragement to ask of him whatever he further needed towards his happiness, he only requested of him that he would think no more of placing his statue in the Temple: and this he did, although at the same time he judged it to be with the manifest hazard of his life<sup>k</sup>. He afterwards obtained a decree from the emperor Claudius, that the Jews might enjoy the free use of their own religious rites throughout the whole Roman empire<sup>l</sup>. When he came first to Jerusalem, after being made king of Judæa, he offered sacrifices of thanksgiving in plenty, leaving nothing undone which the law required. Wherefore, also, he ordered a great number of Nazarites to be shaved<sup>m</sup>. When some bold and daring youths of Dora, a city in Phœnicia, had placed a statue of Cæsar in the synagogue of the Jews, he was very highly provoked, (because it was in effect the destruction of the laws of his country,) and immediately went to Publius Petronius, the governor of Syria, and obtained from him a decree that the criminals should be brought before the governor by Proclus Vitellius the centurion; and that the magistrates of the city, unless they were willing to be esteemed parties, should inform the centurion who they were<sup>n</sup>. Josephus further informs us, that his constant residence was at Jerusalem, and that he took delight in living there, and punctually observed the laws of

<sup>i</sup> Philo de Legat. p. 1037, d. Πάντα ὑπαλλάττομαι ἐνὸς τοῦ μὴ κινηθῆναι τὰ πάτρια.

<sup>k</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 9. §. 7, 8.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. l. 19. c. 5. §. 3.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. c. 6. §. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. c. 6. §. 3.



his country: that he kept himself free from pollution, conducting his life with all purity; nor was there a day passed, in which he did not offer the sacrifice required by the law<sup>o</sup>. Can we make the least doubt, that a person who took such pains and ran such hazards to preserve the Jewish rites, and was so exact in the practice of them himself, would be careful to educate his children in the knowledge and observance of the same; more especially when he spent so much of his time at Jerusalem, the great school for that sort of learning? That accordingly, both Agrippa his son, and Bernice his daughter, notwithstanding their other faults, were not a little zealous for the Jewish customs, is apparent from divers parts of their conduct. Agrippa would not permit his youngest sister Drusilla to be joined in wedlock to Epiphanes, the son of king Antiochus, because he refused to forsake his own religion and embrace the Jewish, although he had promised her father that he would; and obliged Azizus king of the Emesenes to be circumcised in order to marry her<sup>p</sup>. Bernice also persuaded Polemon king of Cilicia to submit to circumcision before he became her husband<sup>q</sup>; and under the government of Florus, when things were in the utmost disorder, and the war was rushing on, she tarried at Jerusalem thirty days, to perform the various ceremonies requisite in the accomplishment of a vow she had made, although most rudely and barbarously treated by Florus; and more than once ran the hazard of her life because she interceded with him to restrain his soldiers from murdering the people<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>o</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 7. §. 3.      <sup>p</sup> L. 20. c. 6. §. 1.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. §. 3.      <sup>r</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 15. §. 1.

## CHAP. III.

*A further account of the occurrences of the times,  
and of the persons named.*

§. 1. I HAVE already observed that there are but very few histories of the transactions of this period which have escaped the injury of time, and are come down safe to us. Those few are very short, and give us but an imperfect view of affairs even of the greatest consequence, and are often entirely silent with regard to what passed in several distant provinces. No wonder therefore if we learn not from them that Sergius Paulus was some part of this time proconsul of Cyprus. If I mistake not, there is no mention made in any history now extant, excepting the book of Acts<sup>s</sup>, of any one thing that happened in this province, or of any governor of it, during this whole period. However, it is worth observing that St. Luke has given the true title to the governor of this province: for although it was a prætorian province<sup>t</sup>, yet, the government of it being in the disposal of the people, Dio assures<sup>u</sup> us, and we have abundant instances in other authors<sup>v</sup> to confirm us in the truth of what he says, that the governor was called proconsul. It is true, Augustus

<sup>s</sup> Ch. xiii.      <sup>t</sup> Vid. Strab. l. 14. fin. p. 685. et l. 17. fin.

<sup>u</sup> L. 54. p. 523. Vid. et Suet. Aug. c. 47. et Dio, l. 53. p. 503, 504, 505.

<sup>v</sup> Crete, Achaia, and Gallia Narbonensis, were, all three, prætorian provinces; and yet are, in exact conformity to the words of Dio and Suetonius, said to be under proconsuls. Vid. Strab. l. 17. fin. Tacit. Annal. l. 3. c. 38. l. 1. c. 76. et Hist. l. 1. c. 48.

Cæsar, in dividing the provinces between himself and the people, at first retained Cyprus to himself, and it was governed by an officer sent by him, called the lieutenant of Cæsar, and *proprætor*; but afterwards he gave it to the people in lieu of a province of theirs, and then the governor sent thither was named *proconsul*<sup>x</sup>, in exact agreement with St. Luke: for the word we have translated *deputy*<sup>y</sup> is that made use of by the Greek writers to signify *proconsul*.

§. 2. And although the province of Greece or Achaia was, at the division made by Augustus, granted to the people<sup>z</sup>, yet afterwards under Tiberius, at the entreaty of the province itself, was it taken into the emperor's care, and governed by his lieutenant, who was *proprætor*<sup>a</sup>. But in the fourth year of the emperor Claudius it was restored to the people, and the title of the Roman governor was again that of *proconsul*<sup>b</sup>. The emperor Nero, who succeeded him, took it from the people a second time, and made the Grecians a free people<sup>c</sup>. If we inquire into the time when St. Paul was brought before Gallio at Corinth, we shall find it to be the latter end of the reign of Claudius, probably in his thirteenth or fourteenth year<sup>d</sup>, when, according to Suetonius, Dio, and Pausanias, it was a Roman pro-

<sup>x</sup> Dio, l. 53. p. 504, a. et l. 54. p. 523, b.

<sup>y</sup> Acts xiii. 7.

<sup>z</sup> Dio, l. 52. p. 503. D. Strab. l. 17. fin.

<sup>a</sup> Tacit. Ann. l. 1. c. 76.

<sup>b</sup> Suet. Claud. c. 25, 10. et 42, 3. Dio, l. 60. p. 680, e. Pausan. Achaic. p. 222. (Han. 428.)

<sup>c</sup> Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 4. c. 6. (vol. 1. p. 196. 4, 5, ult. ed.) Pausan. loco citato. Philostrate. Apoll. v. 14. Suet. Vespas. c. 8. n. 21. <sup>d</sup> Vid. Annal. Paul. p. 13.

vince belonging to the people. It is with the greatest accuracy therefore, you see, that the Roman governor at this time is said by St. Luke to be proconsul of Achaia; for so the word we render *deputy* properly signifies<sup>c</sup>: and this is the more remarkable, because several of the classic authors, when writing of events that happened not long before this time, have been mistaken in the titles they have given to governors of provinces, as is abundantly proved by Pitiscus in his notes on Suetonius<sup>f</sup>, and cardinal Norisius in his *Cenotaphium Pisanum*<sup>g</sup>, and many other learned writers.

The historians of this time say little or nothing of the affairs of Achaia, nor do they tell us who was governor of this province under the emperor Claudius. But there is very great probability that Gallio, mentioned by St. Luke as proconsul, was no other than the brother of Seneca the moral philosopher, whose writings are so well known amongst us. Learned men are generally of this opinion: and as there is no one thing, that I know of, which renders it unlikely, so there are many things concurring which may induce us to believe it. That Marcus Annæus Seneca the rhetorician had three sons, named Novatus, Seneca, and Mela, appears from the dedication of his *Book of Controversies* to them: that Novatus the eldest changed his name for Gallio<sup>h</sup>, (probably as having been adopted by Junius

<sup>c</sup> Acts xviii. 12.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. in Aug. c. 3. n. 16. and the persons cited there.

<sup>g</sup> Dissert. 2. c. 11. in the last edition, tom. 3. p. 327, 328.

<sup>h</sup> Compare the dedication of Marcus Seneca with Eusebius's Chron. Tacit. Annal. l. 16, 17. Dio, l. 61. p. 689. et l. 62. p. 713. Compare what Seneca says to his mother Helvia, de Con-

Gallio, so frequently mentioned in Seneca the father's works, and often called by him *our*<sup>i</sup> *Gallio*,) sufficiently appears from the writings of the two Senecas, Tacitus, Dio, and Eusebius: that he attained to the honours of the Roman state, is fully evident from what Seneca the philosopher writes to his mother Helvia<sup>k</sup>, in order to comfort her in his own absence, being at that time under sentence of banishment in the isle of Corsica: that he had been in Achaia also, seems no less evident from one of Seneca's Epistles<sup>l</sup>: that his temper and manners were every way agreeable to what is said of him in the history of the Acts<sup>m</sup>, we learn from the character given him by his brother Seneca<sup>n</sup>.

That he took not cognisance of the cause which was brought before him proceeded not from his stupidity, indolence, or negligence, but from his strict adherence to the Roman laws. Some indeed, of late, have represented him as entertaining an opinion that the civil magistrate had nothing to do in matters of religion. But this is a thought that never entered a Roman heart; and such must be entire

sol. c. 16. "Respice fratres meos—alter honores industria con-  
"secutus est, alter sapienter contempsit," with what Tacitus re-  
lates, Ann. l. 16, 17; "Mela, quibus Gallio et Seneca parentibus  
"natus, petitione honorum abstinuerat," &c. Vid. et Ann. l. 15.  
73. et Senec. de Vita Beata, pr. et Nat. Quæst. l. 4. præf.

<sup>i</sup> M. Annæi Senec. Controv. 13. et frequenter alibi.

<sup>k</sup> Loco citato.

<sup>l</sup> Ep. 104. pr. Vid. Lips. ad Tac. Ann. l. 2. 87. Excur. P. where he proves that the title *Dominus* was given to fathers, brothers, and others.

<sup>m</sup> Acts xviii. 12, &c.

<sup>n</sup> Nat. Quæst. l. 4. præf. Vid. Selden's Letter to Bishop Usher, vol. 4. p. 1712.



strangers to the history of that great and flourishing people, who can impute this their novel invention to any wise and good Roman. It is well known that the affairs of religion were always a principal part of the care of the Roman magistrates and senate; and as they had many laws on that subject, so we frequently read of their execution. The true reason why Gallio did not interpose in the affair brought before him, was because the senate and emperors had by various decrees <sup>o</sup>, and particularly the then reigning emperor Claudius, allowed the Jews every where under their dominion to govern themselves according to their own laws in all matters of religion <sup>p</sup>. This being such, he esteemed it not of his cognisance; therefore he says, *I will be no judge of such matters* <sup>q</sup>: had you accused this man of injustice, violence, or crimes against the state, I would willingly have heard you; but I am not sent here as a judge of your religious differences; these are to be rectified amongst yourselves. The accusation brought against St. Paul by the Jews was, that *he persuaded men to worship God contrary to their law* <sup>r</sup>. Of this themselves were to determine, not the Roman governor. The speech which Porcius Festus makes to king Agrippa in the like case may help to clear this: *They brought no accusations of such things as I supposed, but had certain questions against him of their own superstition: and because I doubted of such manner of questions,* that is, did not think them to appertain to my jurisdiction, *I asked him, whether he would go to Jeru-*

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Joseph. Antiq. l. 14. c. 10. §. 2. et 23. l. 16. c. 2. §. 3. c. 6. §. 2.      <sup>p</sup> Ibid. l. 19. c. 5. §. 2, 3.      <sup>q</sup> Acts xviii. 15.

<sup>r</sup> Acts xviii. 13.

*salem, and there be judged of these matters*<sup>s</sup> before the sanhedrim, as esteeming them to be the proper judges of such causes.

§. 3. Agabus the prophet foretold that there should be a great famine throughout all the world. It is added by St. Luke, *which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar*<sup>t</sup>. It is very certain that the word *οἰκουμένη*, which we render *world*, is often taken in a more restrained sense<sup>u</sup>, and signifies one country, and particularly that of Judæa. It is also evident from Josephus, that there was a sore famine in Judæa during the fifth, sixth, and not improbably the seventh year also of Claudius<sup>x</sup>, insomuch that not a few perished at Jerusalem for want, and many more must have done so, had it not been for the charitable care of Helena, Izates, and others. If therefore we take the prophecy in this sense, that there should be a great dearth throughout the whole land of Judæa, (and the words will well bear that sense,) nothing is more plain than that it was exactly fulfilled. But Eusebius, who lived in the latter end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth centuries, understands it in a more extensive sense, and tells us that the event was accordingly<sup>y</sup>; and expressly says that this event was delivered down by authors who were no friends to the Christian religion<sup>z</sup>. There were many such extant in his

<sup>s</sup> Acts xxv. 18, 19, 20.

<sup>t</sup> Acts xi. 28.

<sup>u</sup> It signifies an inhabited land of any dimensions, Is. xiii. 9. That it is restrained to a particular country, vid. Ps. lxxi. 8. That it is put for Judæa, vid. Is. x. 23. and xiii. 5. and xxiv. 1, 4. Luke xxi. 26.

<sup>x</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 2. §. 6. et c. 4. §. 2.

<sup>y</sup> Hist. l. 2. c. 12. et Chron.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. c. 8.

time, that are now irrecoverably lost. Why then may we not believe that the famine spread much further than the limits of Judæa, especially when it is acknowledged that this is agreeable to the more usual sense of the word *οἰκουμένη*?

A universal famine indeed at one and the same time, if great and pressing, must bid fair to destroy the whole human race: but may it not have been a progressive famine, which passed from one country to another, not oppressing too great a part of the world at once, but proceeding from one part to another, till it had visited the whole? It is not improbable that St. Luke in this place, as is usual with all historians, lays together in few words what happened in a course of some years. There cannot be the least doubt but that the prophecy preceded the event some space of time: nor is it reasonable to suppose that Barnabas and Saul were sent to Jerusalem with a supply till it began to be wanted. It is true, at the beginning of the relation it is said, *And in those days*; but is there any necessity of confining the words *those days* to the last-mentioned year, which was that Barnabas and Saul spent at Antioch? may they not very reasonably be extended so as to include the whole time from the day that the conversion of Cornelius and his friends was made known to the preachers who went to Antioch, hinted at in the twentieth verse<sup>a</sup>, which probably happened in the last year of Caius Caligula? That the prophecy was delivered in his reign seems confirmed by the account given of the fulfilment in these words, *which came to pass in the*

<sup>a</sup> Acts xi. 20.

*days of Claudius Cæsar*<sup>b</sup>: a manner of expression, which, I think, would hardly have been used if the prophecy had been delivered in the same reign in which it was fulfilled. True, indeed, there are some copies wherein it is read, *which also came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar*. But the best copies<sup>c</sup> read it as our English translators have rendered it: and indeed, were the other the true reading, I should be apt to think that those words, ὅστις καὶ ἐγένετο, *which also came to pass*, were a parenthesis, and then the prophecy would be more determinate, as fixing the time when the famine was to happen; *that there should be a great dearth throughout all the world in the days of Claudius Cæsar*. I make no doubt but the prophecy was understood by those that heard it, as what was to come to pass in the space of a few years; and so it certainly did, if delivered at the end of the reign of Caius: for a famine began in some parts in the second, if not in the first year of Claudius<sup>d</sup>; and that in Judæa began the latter end of his fourth.

I have not yet seen a sufficient reason given why we may not conclude that the scarcity we read of, as having affected any country during the reign of Claudius, was part of this great famine foretold. It is indeed said, “that the persons who heard this  
“prophecy delivered, understood it to relate to  
“Judæa only, because there is not the least hint of  
“any thought of sending relief to any other place;  
“nor yet of any hesitation in taking the resolution  
“to send relief thither, for fear their own circum-

<sup>b</sup> Acts xi. 28.

<sup>c</sup> Alex. Cantab. Lincoln. Vulg. Æthiop.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. anno Dom. 42. n. 7.

“stances might be necessitous through the ap-  
“proaching famine<sup>e</sup>.” But is it certain that the  
disciples formed this resolution at the time when  
the prophecy was delivered? might it not, for any  
thing appears to the contrary, be a determination  
made by them when they heard that their brethren  
in Judæa began to be in straits? and supposing it  
to be formed when the prophecy was first given, if  
they understood it not of a famine that should op-  
press the whole world in one and the same year, but  
of a famine that should proceed gradually from one  
country to another, till every part had felt it; might  
they not very reasonably determine to send relief  
to their neighbours, when under this calamity, ac-  
cording to their ability? would not this be a ready  
way to engage their neighbours to return the obli-  
gation, and to relieve them when under the like  
distress? It is highly probable, that the design of  
this prophecy was to put them upon saving and lay-  
ing up all they could possibly spare from their ne-  
cessary uses, till the famine should reach themselves  
or neighbours, that they might be the better able to  
supply their own or others’ wants: and the plain  
reason why Judæa was first in their thoughts, and  
they determined to send relief to that country, ra-  
ther than to any other, was because of the exceed-  
ing great distress that country must necessarily be  
in, at such a time, from the very great number of  
poor that were always in it. The Jews from all  
parts of the world sent alms to Judæa even in times  
of the greatest plenty. If so universal a collection  
of alms were necessary in times of plenty, how much

<sup>e</sup> Lardner’s Cred. vol. 1. p. 522, 523.



more necessary must it have been in a time of famine: the crowds of people that flocked to Jerusalem upon account of divine worship, caused a scarcity to be felt there immediately in the most sensible manner. Josephus tells us, that when Cestius Gallus came to Jerusalem at the feast of unleavened bread, not less than three millions of people came about him, entreating him to have compassion on the miserable state of their nation, and crying out that Florus was the pest of the country<sup>f</sup>. I may also add, that we have no room to doubt but that those who converted the Christians at Antioch put them in mind of the wants of their brethren in Judæa.

I see no reason as yet, therefore, why we may not conclude that not only the famine which was in Judæa in the fifth, sixth, and seventh of Claudius, mentioned by Josephus<sup>g</sup>, but that the famine which happened in Rome the second of Claudius, mentioned by Dio<sup>h</sup>, that in Syria, mentioned by Orosius, in the fourth of Claudius<sup>i</sup>, that which afflicted Greece about the ninth of Claudius, when a bushel of wheat was sold for one pound eleven shillings sterling<sup>k</sup>, and that which prevailed in Italy and

<sup>f</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 14. §. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 2. §. 6. et c. 4. §. 2. He mentions a great famine under Claudius, when Ishmael was high priest, Antiq. l. 3. c. 15. *prope fin.*: but he herein plainly contradicts himself: for Ishmael the son of Phabi was twice high priest, once made so by Valerius Gratus, afterwards by Agrippa under Nero. Vid. Antiq. l. 18. c. 2. §. 2. et l. 20. c. 7. §. 8. He says, in this famine an assaron of meal was sold for four drachmas.

<sup>h</sup> L. 60. p. 671.

<sup>i</sup> L. 7. c. 6. compared with what he says of Syria, l. 1. c. 2.

<sup>k</sup> Euseb. Chron.

Rome the tenth and eleventh of Claudius, mentioned by Tacitus<sup>l</sup>, Suetonius<sup>m</sup>, Eusebius<sup>n</sup>, and Orosius<sup>o</sup>, were in part the fulfilment of this prophecy.

§. 4. It is said in the Acts that the emperor *Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome*<sup>p</sup>. Of this fact Suetonius is witness, who expressly tells us that Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome<sup>q</sup>. Dio indeed says that he did not expel them, but forbade all their religious assemblies<sup>r</sup>. This was in effect an expulsion; if he would not permit them to assemble on their sabbaths, and the other days, which their law enjoined, they could live there no longer as Jews. However, Suetonius, who flourished in the times of the emperors Trajan and Hadrian, may be supposed to know the true state of the fact better than one who lived under the emperors Severus, Caracalla, and Alexander, near a hundred years after<sup>s</sup>. Orosius also says that the Jews were expelled by Claudius, and alleges Josephus as an author who relates it<sup>t</sup>. There is no such relation in the copies of Josephus which are come down to us; but whether there might not be in those of his time, which was the beginning of the

<sup>l</sup> Ann. l. 12. 43.

<sup>m</sup> Claud. c. 18. 3. "Arctiore annona ob assiduas sterilitates." This expression not a little confirms my notion. Crops had failed for many years past; some years probably in one country, and some years in another of those countries from whence they used to import corn to Rome.

<sup>n</sup> Chron.

<sup>o</sup> L. 7. c. 6. prope fin. The learned Basnage is of my opinion. "Oraculum annos etiam omnes qui regnante Claudio fame pal-  
lidi complexum fuerit." *Annal.* p. 521. Vid. et p. 553. n. 4.

<sup>p</sup> Ch. xviii. 2. <sup>q</sup> Claud. c. 25. 12. <sup>r</sup> L. 60. p. 669.

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Fabric. Biblioth.

<sup>t</sup> L. 7. c. 6.

fifth century, is not, I think, so very improbable a thing <sup>u</sup> as some have represented it.

§. 5. That the island of Melita, now called Malta, was at the time of St. Paul's voyage in the hands of the Romans, I suppose no one can doubt: that it was taken from the Carthaginians by Atilius Regulus the consul, Orosius is witness <sup>x</sup>: that in Tully's time it was under the prætor of Sicily, is evident from his accusation of Verres <sup>y</sup>: that after this it could not be taken from the Romans before St. Paul made his voyage, cannot, I think, admit of a suspicion: that before the Romans had it the Phœnicians and Carthaginians inhabited it, appears from Scylax and Diodorus Siculus <sup>z</sup>. We may very reasonably suppose that at the time of St. Paul's being there the generality of the people were their descendants: hence it is said in the book of Acts, *The barbarous people shewed us no little kindness* <sup>a</sup>: for all that did not use the Greek language were by the Greeks named barbarous <sup>b</sup>. That the governor, who resided in this island on behalf of the Romans, was called *πρωτος*, or, as we have rendered it, *the chief man* <sup>c</sup>, is evident from an inscription that was found there by Quintinus Heduus, in which the person named is called *πρωτος Μελιταίων* <sup>d</sup>.

§. 6. Claudius Lysias the Roman officer, *præfectus cohortis*, or chief captain of the band, says to St. Paul, when he had taken him out of the hands of the Jews, who would have put him to death, *Art*

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Hudson. Joseph. p. 1060. n. g. et 1065. n. b.    <sup>x</sup> L. 4. c. 8.    <sup>y</sup> L. 4. 18. et 46.    <sup>z</sup> L. 5.    <sup>a</sup> Ch. xxviii. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Strabo, l. 14. p. 455.    <sup>c</sup> Acts xxviii. 7.    <sup>d</sup> Johan. Quint. Heduus ad Soph. Epist. an. 1533. Vid. Bochart. Phaleg. p. 2. l. 1. p. 552, 547. Grot. in loc. Cellarium, vol. 1. p. 655.

*thou that Egyptian, which before these days madest an uproar, and leddest out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers*<sup>e</sup>? The word which we translate here *murderers* is the Latin word *sicarii*, so called from a little sword or dagger which they wore concealed under their clothes, and resembled the Roman *sica*. The Jewish historian Josephus, immediately after he has given us an account of the rise of these *sicarii*, or murderers, (for with this concealed weapon they daily committed many murders,) adds the story of the Egyptian impostor<sup>f</sup>, who persuaded a multitude of the common people to go with him from Jerusalem. This multitude probably were the four thousand *sicarii* mentioned by Lysias. Having led them round through the wilderness, and brought them to the mount of Olives, and in his way having increased his number to thirty thousand men, Felix the Roman governor met and attacked him. The Egyptian, perceiving at the same time that the generality of the Jewish nation were so far from joining with him as he had flattered himself they would, that they made head against and opposed him, immediately fled with a few of his chief adherents, the most of which were either taken or slain<sup>g</sup>; but as for himself he made his escape. This happening

<sup>e</sup> Acts xxi. 38.

<sup>f</sup> De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 13. §. 5. Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 6. 10.

<sup>g</sup> It is very difficult to reconcile the two accounts given of this matter by Josephus. Mr. Ward, the learned professor of Gresham college, seems to have conquered this difficulty. Vid. Additions to Lardner's Cred. vol. 1. 2. I have told the story as briefly as I could in his manner, whereby he reconciles Josephus both to himself and to St. Luke.

but a few months before St. Paul came to Jerusalem, the chief captain Lysias seeing the uproar that was made upon his account, it entered his mind that the Egyptian was taken, and that St. Paul might be the man. This occasioned the question he asked him.

§. 7. We read in the Acts of the conversion of the eunuch, who was of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians<sup>b</sup>. It is evident, both from Strabo<sup>i</sup> and Dio<sup>k</sup>, that there was a queen of that name in Ethiopia, who fought against the Romans about the twenty-second or twenty-third year of the reign of Augustus Cæsar, reckoning it from the death of his uncle Julius. It is clear also from Pliny<sup>l</sup>, who flourished in the reign of the emperor Vespasian, that there was a queen of Ethiopia named Candace in his time; and he adds, that this had been the name of their queens now for many years. It is beyond all doubt therefore that there was a queen of Ethiopia of this name at the time when Philip is said to have converted the eunuch. Eusebius tells us that this country continued to be governed by women even to his time<sup>m</sup>.

§. 8. Two years before Felix left the government of Judæa, we are told in the history of the Acts that Ananias was high priest<sup>n</sup>: and this is confirmed by Josephus, who relates, that Ananias, the son of Nabadæus, was made high priest of the Jewish nation in the room of Joseph the son of Camyodus, by Herod king of Chalcis<sup>o</sup>. This he places just

<sup>b</sup> Ch. viii. 27.

<sup>i</sup> L. 17. p. 820.

<sup>k</sup> L. 54. p. 524.

<sup>l</sup> N. H. l. 6. c. 29.

<sup>m</sup> Hist. l. 2. c. 1. Vid. Alex. ab Alex.

l. 1. c. 2.

<sup>n</sup> Ch. xxiii. 2. and xxiv. 1.

<sup>o</sup> Antiq. l. 20.

c. 4. §. 2.



before the death of Herod, which he tells us happened in the eighth year of the emperor Claudius. He says not one word of any other person's being made high priest till Felix is quitting the government of Judæa. Immediately before the account of his departure, he relates, that king Agrippa (who had succeeded his uncle Herod, and after that, in lieu of Chalcis, had received the tetrarchy of Philip) gave the high-priesthood to Ishmael the son of Phabi<sup>p</sup>, and at the same time is not obscurely hinted the reason why he removed Ananias. For there is added the vile insult committed by the high priests on the inferior priests and people, the high priests by force seizing on the tithes which were due to the inferior priests, so that the priests, who before this subsisted on their tithes, perished for want. We are informed afterwards, not only that Ananias was guilty of this wickedness, but it is strongly insinuated that the other high priests followed his example herein; that he was therefore the author and ringleader of this violence and complicated injustice<sup>q</sup>. It appears highly probable to me, that king Agrippa, not being able by his authority to suppress this evil, (for he had no other authority over Judæa than that of making and removing their high priest,) took the only step he had in his power towards the discouraging it, and that was by displacing Ananias, who first began this villainous practice.

The fact lies so very clear in Josephus, that it has been matter of surprise to me that learned men should ever have made the least doubt whether Ana-

<sup>p</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 8, 9.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. c. 8. §. 2. 4.

nias were at this time the high priest of the Jews. Some have hinted as a reason his being sent prisoner to Rome. There happening a quarrel between the Samaritans and Jews, in which was rapine and bloodshed, the Samaritans so far obtained the ear of Quadratus, the president of Syria, that he sent Ananias and his son Ananus prisoners to Rome, as esteeming them the guilty persons, and ordered the chief of the Samaritan nation to follow as their accusers<sup>r</sup>. If there be any strength in this objection, it must, I suppose, lie in one of these three things; either that Quadratus at this time deprived Ananias of the priesthood, or that his being a prisoner disqualified him for that high office, or that his being absent at Rome was inconsistent herewith. It is nowhere said nor intimated that Quadratus deprived him: and indeed the presidents of Syria had no such power at the time we are speaking of, it having been vested by Claudius in the family of Herod<sup>s</sup>: and could we suppose that Quadratus invaded another's province, and deprived him as thinking him guilty? Can it be imagined that Claudius did not fully restore him, when he not only pronounced him innocent, but thought him so much wronged by the accusation brought against him that he put to death his accusers? And Jonathan, one of those Jews who were sent to Rome with him by Quadratus, was in so high estimation at court, that he had interest sufficient to procure for Felix the government of Judæa in the room of Cumanus, who favoured the Samaritans, and was for that reason deprived and banished<sup>t</sup>.

<sup>r</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 5. §. 2, 3.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. c. 1. §. 3.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. c. 5. §. 3. et c. 7. §. 5.

Nor can I understand that his having been made a prisoner was a disqualification. I do not perceive that the learned Selden found any such thing mentioned either in the Talmudists or other Jewish writers<sup>u</sup>: and we are told by Josephus, that when Hyrcanus the high priest was taken captive by the Parthians, and by them delivered up to Antigonus his competitor, Antigonus bit off part of his ears in order to disqualify him for the priesthood for the future<sup>x</sup>. He knew certainly that his having been a captive was no disqualification; for if it had, it would have been entirely needless to have used the other cruel method. Now if captivity was no disqualification, how much less the being made a prisoner upon suspicion of guilt in order to take a trial! It is true indeed, we read, that the being born of a woman that had been a captive was a disqualification for the high-priesthood. But the reason of that is given both by Josephus<sup>y</sup> and the Talmudists<sup>z</sup>. It was not from the indignity suffered by being taken captive, but from the suspicion that she might have been defiled by those who took her captive.

Nor was the going to Rome inconsistent with the office of high priest. It is true, when Ishmael the high priest, who succeeded Ananias, was sent to Rome, a successor was appointed him; but the reason is at the same time added, and that was, because he was detained by the empress Poppæa as

<sup>u</sup> Vid. de Success. in Pontif. l. 2. c. 1—6.

<sup>x</sup> Antiq. l. 14. c. 13. §. 10. et l. 15. c. 2. §. 2. et de Bell. l. 1. c. 13. §. 9. Vid. et Antiq. l. 20. c. 9. p. 900. l. 12.

<sup>y</sup> Contra Apion. l. 1. §. 7. p. 1333. l. 13.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Selden. de Success. in Pontif. l. 2. c. 2, 3.

an hostage. Josephus says, when king Agrippa heard this, he gave the high-priesthood to Joseph, surnamed Cabi<sup>a</sup>; but not till he heard that he was detained, and could not return to perform his office. This was not the case of Ananias. We read not of any the least delay in the hearing of his cause, and the dismissing him.

Another occasion of doubt hinted at by learned men is, that in the history of Josephus, between the time in which the high-priesthood was conferred on Ananias, and the time when it was given to Ishmael, there is mention made of Jonathan the high priest<sup>b</sup>. But it is not said nor hinted that he had the high-priesthood at this time bestowed on him. The only reason of his being named in this place is to shew the ingratitude, baseness, and wickedness of Felix the Roman governor. For although Jonathan, as we have observed before, procured for him the government of Judæa, Felix corrupted one of Jonathan's familiar friends, who hired villains that murdered him. As it is for this reason only that he is here mentioned, so is he called high priest, because he formerly had executed that high office in the reign of Tiberius, being placed in it by Vitellius, president of Syria<sup>c</sup>: and it must be well known to any one who is conversant in Josephus, that it is customary with him to call all those high priests who have once enjoyed that dignity, although they had been deprived of it many years<sup>d</sup>. Thus he does Jonathan, not only in the place before us, but where

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 11. fin.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. c. 7. §. 5.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. l. 18. c. 5. §. 3. fin.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 2.

de Bell. l. 2. c. 17. §. 2. 6. 9. l. 5. c. 5. §. 2. Vita, §. 38.

he mentions his being sent with Ananias to Rome<sup>e</sup>, at which time that Ananias was truly the high priest no one ever moved the least doubt. Jonathan was indeed offered the high-priesthood in the reign of Claudius by king Agrippa, but he refused it, desiring rather that it should be conferred on his brother Matthias, which accordingly it was<sup>f</sup>. This renders it the less probable that he should so soon after be offered it again, or that, if offered, he should accept it. Besides, it is very likely he was killed before St. Paul was tried by Ananias<sup>g</sup>.

<sup>e</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 12. §. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Antiq. l. 19. c. 6. §. 4.

<sup>g</sup> Jonathan's murder was not long after the beginning of Nero's reign. Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 4, 5. St. Paul was not brought before Ananias till about the fifth year of that reign.

Josephus relates, that from the time of Herod to the destruction of Jerusalem were twenty-eight high priests. Antiq. l. 20. c. 10. prop. fin. The learned Reland thinks that this number cannot be made out from the foregoing account of Josephus without taking in this Jonathan. But if the twenty-eight must necessarily be distinct persons, and not the same person reckoned twice, (for Ananias, we are sure, was twice in that high office,) why may there not be two Joazarus's rather than two Jonathans? We read that Joazarus was made high priest in the room of Matthias by Herod the Great, l. 17. c. 6. §. 4. and that he was removed by Archelaus, l. 17. c. 13. §. 1. that he was succeeded by Eleazar, and Eleazar by Jesus the son of Sie, *ibid.* Notwithstanding, we read afterwards of a Joazarus who was high priest when Quirinus confiscated the estate of Archelaus, and that he was helpful to him in appeasing the people, l. 18. c. 1. §. 1; and it is expressly said that Quirinus took away the dignity of the high-priesthood from Joazarus, and made Ananus the son of Seth high priest, *ibid.* c. 2. §. 1. If Jonathan be a different person from him that was made high priest by Vitellius, it is nowhere said that he was made high priest, or that he was deprived of that dignity; nor is there any probability that he ever enjoyed that high office. But as for the second Joazarus, it appears evidently that he was in that office, and was deprived of it by Vitellius.



It may have occasioned a doubt to some that Josephus, in the third book of his Antiquities, towards the end, mentions Ishmael as high priest in the reign of the emperor Claudius. But the Ishmael there spoken of can noways interfere with Ananias, because he specifies the particular time when that Ishmael was high priest, by the severity of the famine which then prevailed at Jerusalem: and it is very evident that the height of the famine was in the fifth and sixth years of the emperor Claudius, which was two years before Ananias was made high priest. Unless Ishmael be another name for Joseph the son of Camydus, either this part of Josephus's history must have been corrupted by the transcriber, or he must have forgotten himself. For in those books, wherein he gives a particular account of the high priests which were made in the reign of Claudius, he makes no mention of Ishmael: and Ishmael the son of Phabi, who succeeded Ananias, he tells us, was made high priest in the reign of Nero<sup>h</sup>.

St. Paul says to Ananias, *God shall smite thee, thou whited wall*<sup>i</sup>. The character given of this man in Josephus very well answers to this description of him by St. Paul. For at the same time that he carried it in the most plausible manner towards the citizens, so as to be in the highest favour and reputation with them<sup>k</sup>, he was guilty of the highest injustice. He, by his servants and other dependants, plundered the priests of their tithes to that degree that many of them perished for want, as we have before observed. What the apostle said to him was doubtless spoken under a prophetic impulse. For

<sup>h</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 8.

<sup>i</sup> Acts xxiii. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 2. 4.

Josephus, in the account he gives us of his death, tells us that his house was burnt, and himself besieged in the royal palace, which being taken, he was drawn out from a cistern, wherein he had hid himself, and was slain; and this in a sedition began most unreasonably and wickedly by his own son<sup>1</sup>. Thus did God smite him according to the prediction of the apostle.

§. 9. We read, Acts v. 34, that *a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, had in great reputation among all the people*, was one of the Jewish council, or sanhedrim. This agrees exactly with what is delivered in the Jewish Talmuds. We are informed by them that Gamaliel, the son of Simeon, and grandson of Hillel, was president of the council; that he was a Pharisee; that he was so well skilled in the law, that he was the second who obtained the name of Rabban, a title of the highest eminency and note of any among their doctors: and concerning him is this saying; "From the time that Rabban Gamaliel the Old died, the honour of the law failed, and purity and pharisaism died." He is called Rabban Gamaliel the Old, to distinguish him from his grandson, who was also called Rabban Gamaliel, and the great-grandson of this grandson, who was also called by the same name, and had the same title, and were both of them, as the Talmudists say, presidents also of the council. They tell us that Rabban Gamaliel the Old died eighteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem<sup>m</sup>, that is, in the year of our Lord 52, about eighteen years after the convention of this council, before whom the apostles

<sup>1</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 17. §. 2. 6. 9.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 1. p. 271. 765. 2009. vol. 2. p. 15. 657.

were brought, as related in the Acts. We read also in Josephus of Simeon, the son of this Gamaliel, as being one of the principal persons of the Jewish nation about three years before the destruction of Jerusalem<sup>n</sup>. The Talmudists say he succeeded his father, and was president of the council.

§. 10. John and Alexander are spoken of, Acts iv. 6, as persons of principal account in the Jewish nation. John probably is no other than Rabban Johanan the son of Zaccai, frequently mentioned in the Talmuds. It is said of him that he had been the scholar of Hillel, and was president of the council after Simeon the son of Gamaliel, who perished in the destruction of the city, and that he lived to be a hundred and twenty years of age. A remarkable saying of his, spoken by him not long before his assembling with the rulers and elders, mentioned Acts iv. is related in the Jerusalem Talmud thus: “Forty years before the destruction of the city, “when the gates of the temple flew open of their “own accord, Rabban Johanan the son of Zaccai “said, O temple, temple, why dost thou disturb thy- “self? I know thy end, that thou shalt be de- “stroyed; for so the prophet Zechariah hath spoken “concerning thee, *Open thy doors, O Lebanon,* “*that the fire may devour thy cedars.*” He lived to see the truth of what he had foretold<sup>o</sup>. By the Alexander mentioned, some learned men<sup>p</sup> understand Alexander the alabarch or governor of the

<sup>n</sup> De Bell. l. 4. c. 3. §. 9. and commends him as a man of great understanding, and capable by his prudence to have restored the affairs of the nation, Vit. §. 38. p. 923. pr.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 2009. and p. 277. 282. vol. 2. p. 652.

<sup>p</sup> Baron. Annal. 34. p. 224. c. Light. vol. 1. p. 277. and 760.

Jews, who dwelt in Egypt: and were he at Jerusalem at the time spoken of, as it is very possible he might, for any thing we can learn to the contrary, nothing would be more probable. For the assembly here spoken of does not seem to be the ordinary council of the Seventy-one, but an extraordinary council, composed of all the chief men of the Jewish nation, from every part of the world, who happened then to be at Jerusalem; and several such it is likely there might be upon the account of some feast. Josephus says of this Alexander, that he was the noblest and richest of all the Jews in Alexandria of his time, and that he adorned the nine gates of the temple at Jerusalem with plates of gold and silver<sup>a</sup>.

§. 11. Acts xiii. 1. there is mention made of certain prophets and teachers, and among them is named Manaen, who, it is said, *had been bred up with Herod the tetrarch*. There is an account in Josephus of one Manaen, an Essene, who foretold concerning Herod the Great that he should be a king, whilst he was yet a boy at school: and when it actually came to pass that he was king, being sent for by Herod, and asked how long he should reign, whether ten years? he answered, Yes. Twenty years? Yes; thirty years. Upon which Herod gave him his right hand, and from that time held in great esteem such who were of the sect of the Essenes<sup>r</sup>. Abr. Zachutus, a Jewish writer, says that this Manaen was vice-president of the sanhedrim under Hillel, and that Shammai succeeded him; that he went off into Herod's family and service with fourscore

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 7. §. 3. fin. l. 19. c. 5. §. 1. fin. l. 20. c. 4. §. 2. et de Bell. l. 5. c. 5. §. 3.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. l. 15. c. 10. §. 5.

eminent men; that he uttered many prophecies; foretold to Herod, when he was yet very young, that he should come to reign; and when he did reign, being sent for, foretold that he should reign above thirty years<sup>s</sup>. The Talmudists also say, "that Manaen went out, and Shammai succeeded him. " But whither went Manaen? Abai says he went "into the service of the king, and with him went "fourscore pair of disciples cloathed all in silk<sup>t</sup>." It is very probable that a son of this Manaen<sup>u</sup>, or some nephew, or other kinsman, to whom he gave his name, was educated in the family of Herod the Great. The young Manaen might be of the same age, and have the same preceptors and tutors as had Herod Antipas, one of the sons of Herod the Great, and for that reason be said to be bred up with him in particular. This Herod Antipas was, after his father's death, tetrarch of Galilee; and is the person who put John the Baptist to death. Josephus says of the first named Manaen, that he was reputed a man of an excellent life. The Talmudists tell us, that, when he left the vice-presidentship of the sanhedrim to go into Herod's service, he went into all manner of wickedness. May they not have fixed this infamy upon him from his having shewn some mark of esteem for Christ and his followers? or from the younger Manaen's becoming a Christian?

<sup>s</sup> Juchasin, p. 19, 1.  
p. 288. 2008.

<sup>t</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 685. vol. 1.

<sup>u</sup> It is, indeed, made a doubt by Dr. Lightfoot whether the Essenes married; but Josephus says expressly that one sort of them did marry, de Bell. l. 2. c. 8. §. 13. p. 1064. It is not improbable also that Manaen might quit the customs of the Essenes when he went to court.



§. 12. Josephus, as we have had occasion before to observe, tells us, that Felix, the governor of Judæa, made use of one Simon, who pretended to be a magician, to solicit Drusilla to forsake her husband, and marry him<sup>x</sup>. Some learned men<sup>y</sup> have conjectured this to be the same Simon who is spoken of in the Acts as having bewitched the people of Samaria with his sorceries. But this is very uncertain, if not wholly improbable<sup>z</sup>.

<sup>x</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 6. §. 2.      <sup>y</sup> Basnage, Annal. 37. c. 35. and Stephen le Moine.

<sup>z</sup> Josephus says this Simon was a Jew of Cyprus. All the fathers agree that Simon in the Acts was a Samaritan by birth. Just. Martyr, p. 69. C. Epiph. Hær. 20. n. 1. Tertull. de Anima, c. 34. Orig. in Celsum, l. 6. p. 73. Clem. Constit. 337. Recogn. 495. c. 2. 512. c. 2. 626. 633. 760. Philastrius in Sim. notwithstanding, says Citteus, as though he were of Cyprus.

## CHAP. IV.

*Shewing how far the various distinctions of the Jews, which happen to be spoken of in the Acts, are confirmed by other authors.*

§. 1. I PROCEED now to the second thing proposed, which is, to shew you how far the various distinctions among the Jews, mentioned in the history of the Acts, are confirmed by other authors. The first is, that of Jews and proselytes. This is a distinction so well known, that it is almost needless to tell you, that by proselytes are understood those of other nations who embrace the Jewish religion either in whole or in part. Those who embraced it wholly were in most things esteemed Jews, as much as if they had descended from the sons of Jacob. In some few things they, their offspring, and all their descendants, unless they sprang from marriages with women who were of the race of Israel, had different laws and customs; whereby there was always a distinction kept up between the posterity of proselytes and the native Jews<sup>a</sup>. The children of proselytes, their grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and so down to all generations, were under the same laws as were the first converted, and therefore were deemed proselytes. If, indeed, any of them married with women of the Jewish race, the children sprung from that marriage were Jews in the strictest sense of the word, as being descendants from Jacob.

Those who embraced the Jewish religion in part

<sup>a</sup> Maim. Issure. Biah, c. 14. Vid. Seld. de Jur. Nat. l. 2. c. 4. p. 194-5-6. l. 5. c. 20. p. 590-1-2.

only, were such who, from among other nations, forsook the idolatry they had been educated in, and worshipped the one only living and true God, the God of the Jews, and observed what are called the seven precepts of Noah. When the Jews were under their own government, they permitted no foreigners to live in the holy land, though it were for never so short a time, if they did not thus far conform to the Jewish religion<sup>b</sup>. Of the first sort of proselytes was Nicolas the deacon, said, in the history of the Acts, to be a proselyte of Antioch<sup>c</sup>. Of the second sort was Cornelius the centurion<sup>d</sup>; and of this latter sort is frequent mention made, by the names of religious<sup>e</sup> or devout persons<sup>f</sup>, of persons that fear God<sup>g</sup>, or who worship God<sup>h</sup>. That there were many who had embraced the Jewish religion about that period of time which is the subject of the history of the Acts, is fully evident from almost all the authors who have wrote of that time, and are now extant; such as Tacitus<sup>i</sup>, Suetonius<sup>k</sup>, Dio<sup>l</sup>, Josephus<sup>m</sup>, and several of the Roman poets, as Horace, Juvenal, Persius.

We read in several parts of the Acts of women proselytes<sup>n</sup>, more especially of the *chief and honourable women*<sup>o</sup>. That the Jews were not a little dili-

<sup>b</sup> Maim. de Reg. et rebus eorum bellicis, c. 8. §. 9, 10. Vid. Seld. de Jur. Nat. l. 2. c. 3. p. 185, 186. <sup>c</sup> Chap. vi. 6.

<sup>d</sup> Ch. x. <sup>e</sup> Acts xiii. 43. <sup>f</sup> Acts xiii. 50. and xvii. 4. 17.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. x. 2. and xiii. 16. 26. <sup>h</sup> Ch. xvi. 14. and xviii. 7. called by the Talmudists, *hasidei omoth haolam*. Maim. de Reg. c. 8. §. 11. Light. v. 2. p. 689. <sup>i</sup> Hist. l. 5. n. 5.

<sup>k</sup> In Tib. 36. 2. <sup>l</sup> L. 36. p. 37. B. <sup>m</sup> De Bell. l. 7. c. 3. §. 3. at Antioch in particular; contra Apion. l. 2. §. 10. p. 1372. l. 28. <sup>n</sup> Ch. xvi. 13, 14. <sup>o</sup> Ch. xiii. 50. and xvii. 4. 12.

gent in gaining over the fair sex to their religion, and particularly such who were of figure and eminence, we learn from the account Josephus has given us of the conversions of Helena<sup>p</sup> and Fulvia<sup>q</sup>, the former a queen, the latter a Roman matron, wife of Saturninus, a favourite of the emperor Tiberius. And that very many women were prevailed with to become proselytes, appears from what he tells us of the citizens of Damascus, who, having formed a design to kill all the Jews in that city, were obliged, with great solicitude, to conceal it from their wives, because they were well nigh all addicted to the Jewish religion<sup>r</sup>.

It is said, Acts ii. 10, that there were at that time in Jerusalem *strangers from Rome*, both *Jews and proselytes*; that is, Jews and proselytes who were by birth or habitation Romans, but now sojourned at Jerusalem. That there were great multitudes of Jews who dwelt at Rome, is evident, not only from Josephus<sup>s</sup>, but from Dio<sup>t</sup>, Suetonius<sup>u</sup>, Tacitus<sup>x</sup>, and I think I may say all the Roman authors of that time, not excepting even the poets<sup>y</sup>; and that there were not a few in that great city proselyted to the Jewish religion, sufficiently appears from the satires of Horace<sup>z</sup>, Juvenal<sup>a</sup>, and Persius<sup>b</sup>.

§. 2. Another distinction we meet with in the history of the Acts is that of Hellenists and He-

<sup>p</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 2. §. 4. and the women of king Abennerigus as well as Helena.      <sup>q</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 4. §. 5.      <sup>r</sup> De Bell.

l. 2. c. 20. §. 2.      <sup>s</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 4. §. 5.      <sup>t</sup> L. 36. p. 37. B.

<sup>u</sup> In Tib. 36. 2.      <sup>x</sup> Annal. l. 2. 85. prop. fin.      <sup>y</sup> Vid. Juv.

Sat. 3. 13, &c. 6. 541, &c.      <sup>z</sup> L. 1. Sat. 4. ver. ult.

<sup>a</sup> Sat. 14. v. 96, &c.      <sup>b</sup> Sat. 5. 179, &c.

brews<sup>c</sup>. Our translators have rendered the word Grecians; but that rendering is far from conveying the true idea of it to the readers. By the Hellenists are to be understood the dispersion among the Greeks, as they are called, John vii. 35. or all those Jews dispersed in the west, who, not understanding the language spoken in Judæa, were obliged to recite their sentences and prayers, and to have the Bible interpreted to them in the Greek language. The language which was at this time usually spoken in the land of Judæa, though not the ancient Hebrew, but, in truth, a dialect of the Chaldee, yet went under the name of the Hebrew language. Such, therefore, who understood this, and to whom the Law and the Prophets, when read in their synagogues, were interpreted in this Chaldaic dialect, went under the name of Hebrews, in contradistinction to those who were named Hellenists. It is true, we meet not with this distinction in express words, either in Josephus or any other Jewish writer. But we find in them those things which were the foundation of it, and which evidently lead to the sense I have now given hereof<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. vi. 1. and ix. 29. and xi. 20. But the best copies in this last place read Ἕλληνες. V. Grot. in loc.

<sup>d</sup> There are several learned men who understand by Hellenists, *proselytes*, such as Beza, Selden, Basnage; but I cannot see the least shadow of a reason to support their opinion. The word *Hellenists* comes from Ἑλληνίζω, *Græco more me gero*, or *Græce loquor*; Ἑλληνιστῆς *qui Græcisat, vel Græce loquitur*; and thus is it translated in the Syriac version, Acts ix. 29. *The Jews speaking the Greek tongue*. Had St. Luke meant *proselytes*, its much he should not use the name *proselytes* here as well as elsewhere; or he might have called them Ἕλληνες Ἰουδαίζοντες, or Ἑβραϊσταί, that is, Greeks who imitated the Hebrew manners; but there



That the Law and the Prophets, though read in their synagogues in the ancient Hebrew, were, by an interpreter, rendered into the language then commonly spoken in Judæa, is fully evident from the Talmudists<sup>e</sup>. They tell us, that in the Prophets three verses were read by the reader, and then those three translated by the interpreter, and then three more read and translated, and so on; but that in the Law no more than a single verse was read, and then interpreted, for fear of a mistake<sup>f</sup>. The reason they gave why the Law and the Prophets were thus interpreted, was, because the ancient Hebrew being no longer the language in common use, this method was necessary to their understanding them<sup>g</sup>. Is not this reason of full as much force when applied to the Jews who understood no other language than the Greek, that they ought to have both interpreted to them in that language? There is no doubt, therefore, but that the Law and the Prophets were interpreted to them in Greek; nor am I sensible that this is a fact disputed by any<sup>h</sup>.

can be no reason in nature assigned why they should be called *Ἑλληγισταί*.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Vitrin. de Synag. vet. l. 3. p. 2. c. 12. p. 1015, &c. Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. in voc. Targem, p. 2642. fin. et in voc. Turgeman, 2643. fin.

<sup>f</sup> Vitr. ibid. p. 1019.      <sup>g</sup> Vitr. ibid. p. 1020. fin. et 1021.

<sup>h</sup> Learned men differ much in their opinion whether the Targum and LXX translation were read in the Jewish synagogues during that period of time we are treating of. Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. voce Elinistin. Grotius in Act. vi. 1. and Prideaux, Conn. vol. 2. p. 414. 425. (who quotes Elias Levita, as saying, in his Methurgeman, pref. p. 246. that the Targum was read, in his time, in the synagogues in Germany) think they were; Vitringa and Lightfoot, that they were not. And it is very certain, if the Talmudists are to be credited, that they were not read. The

Rabbi Levi ben Chaiatha, going down to Cæsarea, heard them reciting the Shema, that is, certain portions of the Law so called<sup>1</sup>, אֱלֵינִי סֵתֵן, a word very near to that we are treating of, heard them reciting their sentences in Greek, and would have forbidden them; which when Rabbi Jose heard, he was very angry, and said, "If a man does not know how to recite in the holy tongue, must he not recite them at all? Let him perform his duty in what language he can." This is related in the Jerusalem Talmud, Sotah, fol. xxi. 2.<sup>m</sup> This sufficiently shews that the Hellenists, or persons who recited their sentences in the Greek language, were esteemed an inferior class of Jews. It is remarkable also, from several parts of the Talmud, that as they set a high value on the Babylonian Jews, so they placed the Jews who were dispersed among the Greeks in the lowest form. It is a saying of theirs, "All lands are a mixed lump, compared with the land of Israel; and the land of Israel is a mixed lump, compared with Babylon<sup>n</sup>." And another: "The Jewish offspring in Babylon is more valuable than that among the Greeks, even purer than that in Judæa itself<sup>o</sup>."

Josephus tells us that the knowledge of foreign languages, and of Greek in particular, was held in

arguments I have made use of noways interest me in this dispute. For both sides agree that the Law and the Prophets were interpreted in the synagogue into a known tongue; whether it was done by reading a written interpretation, or without reading, is of no importance to my argument.

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Vit. Syn. vet. l. 3. p. 2. c. 15. p. 1051, &c.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 661. Grot. in Act. vi. 1. Buxtorf. L. Talmud. in voce Elinistin.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 799.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. p. 558.

no esteem with his countrymen, was looked upon as a common attainment, and such as their slaves might be masters of; but that skill in their law, and an ability to interpret the sacred books, was greatly admired<sup>p</sup>. In the Talmud is this execration said to be made at the time when Aristobulus besieged his brother Hyrcanus: "Cursed be the man that cherisheth  
 " swine; and cursed be the man that teacheth his son  
 " the wisdom of the Greeks<sup>q</sup>." And in the war with Titus they decreed that no man should teach his son Greek<sup>r</sup>. This decree, as appears by the gloss upon the former passage, was made first in the days of the Asmonæans; but, having been neglected, was revived in the war with Titus. And Rabban Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, is made to say, "There were a  
 " thousand in my father's school, of whom five hundred learnt the law, and five hundred the wisdom  
 " of the Greeks; and there is not one of the last  
 " now alive, excepting myself and my uncle's son." This is related as the effect of the foregoing curse, to shew that the judgments of God followed those who, in opposition to the decree of the sanhedrim, studied the Greek learning. And the reason is immediately added why he and his cousin-german escaped the dreadful effects of this curse: "They  
 " allowed the family of Rabban Gamaliel the Greek  
 " learning, because they were allied to the royal  
 " blood<sup>s</sup>." They permitted, it seems, those who

<sup>p</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. ult. §. ult. to which Origen also may be added, contra Cels. l. 2. p. 80. fin.

<sup>q</sup> Bava kama, fol. 82. 2. Vid. not. l'Empereur ad Bava kama, c. 7. §. 7. n. 5. Light. vol. 2. p. 660. Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 9. §. 2. p. 1417. fin. 1418.

<sup>r</sup> Mishna Sota, c. 9. §. 14. Vid. not. Wagen.

<sup>s</sup> Gemara. Bav. kam. f. 82. 2. and Sotah, fol. 40. 1. Vid.

were of the lineage of David to be brought up in all kind of learning. Now if the Greek language and learning were in so low an estimation among those Jews who understood Hebrew, how mean, in their opinion, must be the Jews who understood no other language than the Greek! This contempt it is which is mentioned in the history of the Acts<sup>t</sup>: *There arose a murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrews.* Why? Because the widows of the Hellenists were overlooked and despised by the Hebrews, as not worthy of relief. And the remains of this difference between the Jews who understood Hebrew, and those who understood it not, seems to have extended as low down as the time of the emperor Justinian; at least there is a law of his extant, which fully proves that they quarrelled in his time whether they should read the scriptures in their synagogues in the Hebrew language alone, or whether they should read them also in a Greek translation<sup>u</sup>.

§. 3. Another distinction among the Jews, mentioned in the history of the Acts, is that noted one

Light. vol. 2. p. 660. The Talmudists, in enumerating the qualifications of the members of the greater and lesser sanhedrims, tell us, that they ought to understand all manner of arts, sciences, and languages; that they ought to be tall, wise, handsome, aged, skilful in magic, and to understand seventy languages. (Was it possible to find a sufficient number of persons with these qualifications?) If we are bound to reconcile the Talmudists, we must take it for granted that not only the royal lineage, but that all those who studied the law, in order to qualify themselves for members of their sanhedrims, were exempted from the curse and law before mentioned. Vid. Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 9. §. 1. p. 1413.

<sup>t</sup> Ch. vi. 1.      <sup>u</sup> Novel. 146. Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 777. vol. 2. p. 659, &c. 798, &c.

of Pharisees and Sadducees. These were distinguished the one from the other, not, as in the former cases, by their birth or by their language, but by the opinions they held; were the two chief sects of the Jewish religion<sup>x</sup>, and directly opposite to each other<sup>y</sup>. It is not my business to give a description of all the tenets of these two sects, but only to observe how far what is said or intimated concerning either of them in the book of Acts is confirmed by other writers. There is frequent mention made of these sects in the Talmudists and other Jewish writers<sup>z</sup>, and particularly in Josephus.

St. Paul says of himself, *After the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee*<sup>a</sup>. And speaking in another place of his having been bred *at the feet of Gamaliel*, a Pharisee, says, that he was *taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers*<sup>b</sup>. Josephus conveys to us exactly the same notion of the sect of the Pharisees in his writings, telling us, that they were thought to expound the Law in a more perfect manner than others, and to excel others in the accurate knowledge they had of the law of their country. He says also, that the Pharisees deliver many laws to the people, which they have received by a successive tradition from the fathers, which are not written in the laws of Moses. And the observation of

<sup>x</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 13. c. 5. §. 9. De Bell. l. 2. c. 8. §. ult. pr. Vid. et Vit. §. 2. <sup>y</sup> Antiq. l. 13. c. 10. §. 6. pr.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 373. and 457, &c. and 655, &c. vol. 2. p. 571, &c. 701, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος. Act. xxvi. 5.

<sup>b</sup> Παιδευμένος κατὰ ἀρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῶου νόμου. Act. xxii. 3.



these having been forbid and punished by Hyrcanus, Alexandra, his daughter-in-law, restored the laws which the Pharisees had introduced according to the tradition of their fathers. Here are not only the same ideas, but a great similitude of expression, as any one may see who will be at the pains to compare the passages together in the original language<sup>c</sup>.

We read, Acts xxiii. 8, that the Pharisees believed a resurrection, and the existence of angels and spirits. In agreement herewith, Josephus tells us, the Pharisees believe “that souls have an immortal force, and that persons will be rewarded or punished under the earth, according as they have made it their business in this life to follow either virtue or vice; that the souls of the one will be confined in an eternal prison, the souls of the other have liberty to live again<sup>d</sup>,” that is, in another body here upon earth. For so I think he explains himself in his book of the Jewish wars, where he says, the Pharisees hold that every soul is immortal, that the soul of the good only passes into another body, but that the soul of the wicked is punished with everlasting punishment<sup>e</sup>.

<sup>c</sup> Οἱ δοκοῦντες μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα. De Bell. l. 2. c. 8. §. 14. pr. Μόριόν τι Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπ’ ἀκριβώσει μέγα φρονοῦν τοῦ πατρίου νόμου. Antiq. l. 17. c. 2. prop. fin. Σύνταγμά τι Ἰουδαίων, δοκοῦν εὐσεβέστερον εἶναι τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβέστερον ἀφηγεῖσθαι. De Bell. l. 1. c. 5. §. 2. Οἱ περὶ τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβεία διαφέρειν. Vit. §. 38. p. 923. pr. Νόμιμα πολλὰ τινα παρέδοσαν τῷ δήμῳ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς——τὰ δ’ ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων. Antiq. l. 13. c. 10. §. 6. prop. fin. Καὶ εἴ τι δὲ καὶ τῶν νομίμων Ἰερκανὸς ὁ πενθερὸς αὐτῆς κατέλυσεν, ὧν εἰσήμεκαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι κατὰ τὴν πατρῶαν παράδοσιν, τοῦτο πάλιν ἀποκατέστησε. Antiq. l. 13. c. 16. §. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 3.

<sup>e</sup> L. 2. c. 8. §. 14.

There was a variety of opinions concerning the resurrection among the Pharisees, or traditionary Jews. Josephus, as I apprehend, has here given us that which comes nearest his own, or which he was most inclined to have the Greek philosophers understand to be his own. For he is accused by learned men, and certainly not without reason, of sometimes accommodating the Jewish revelation to the sentiments of the heathen, or bringing it as near to what was taught by them as might be. The Pharisees, according to him, believed the separate existence of human spirits, rewards and punishments in a future state, and that the good should return to life here on earth, or obtain a resurrection, but not in the same body. This falls in with what he delivers as his own sentiments, saying, in his book against Apion, "That to those who observe the law of Moses, or die for it, if need be, God hath granted, " that after a revolution of years they shall be born " again, and receive a better life<sup>f</sup>." And much to the same purpose in his Book of Wars; " That pure " and obedient souls continue possessing a most holy " place in heaven, whence, after a revolution of ages, " they shall again be placed in pure bodies, as in " houses<sup>g</sup>."

The Talmudists also frequently speak of the transmigration of the souls of good men. According to some of them the soul of Abel went into

<sup>f</sup> L. 2. §. 30. prop. fin. p. 1383.

<sup>g</sup> L. 3. c. 7. p. 1144, 1145. Vid. et l. 1. c. ult. §. 2. ad fin. The curious may also see how separate souls are, in his opinion, employed, by what he says of the ghosts of Alexander and Aristobulus, de Bell. l. 1. c. 30. §. 7. prop. fin. and c. 31. §. 2. pr. fin.

Seth, and the soul of Seth into Moses<sup>b</sup>. Others of them say, that the soul of Phinehas and Elias was the same<sup>i</sup>. Others, that the soul of Adam went into David<sup>k</sup>, and that of Jeremiah was in Zechariah<sup>l</sup>. It was manifestly owing to this opinion that some persons in our Saviour's time said of him, *that he was Jeremiah, or one of the ancient prophets*<sup>m</sup>. Others among the Jews held the transmigration of the souls of the wicked, and that by way of punishment. It is said in the Talmud, that the souls of men pass from body to body upon these terms, that if a soul sin in the first body, it be sent into a second, in which, if it again sins, it be sent into a third body, in which, if it leaves not off sinning, it be at length thrown into hell<sup>n</sup>. To some such opinion there seems to be an evident allusion when the disciples say to our Lord concerning the blind man, *Who sinned, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind*<sup>o</sup>?

St. Paul says, Acts xxiv. 15, *I have good hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust*. And without doubt the prevailing opinion among the Jews was that there should be a general resurrection<sup>p</sup>. Some few

<sup>b</sup> Baba mezia. Vid. Sixt. Sin. Bib. Sac. l. 2. tit. T. fin.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxiv. 2.      <sup>k</sup> Ibid.      <sup>l</sup> Grot. in Matt. xvi. 14.      <sup>m</sup> Matt. xvi. 14. Luke ix. 8.      <sup>n</sup> Baba mezia, et multis aliis locis. Vid. Sixt. Sen. Bib. San. l. 2. tit. T. fin.

<sup>o</sup> John ix. 2. That the Jews held the Pythagorean transmigration of souls, vid. Seld. de Jur. Nat. l. 7. c. 9. fin. p. 745. and l. 2. c. 4. p. 193, 194. and Prid. Conn. vol. 2. p. 265, 266.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 541, 542. 701. 787. vol. 1. p. 676. and 759. Mede's Works, p. 797. 801. 880. Buxt. Chal. Lex. in voc. Techija, p. 745. in voc. Tekuma, p. 2001.

possibly might think that all will not receive their own bodies. To this purpose is that saying in the Talmud, The souls of unlearned men shall not receive their own bodies at the resurrection<sup>q</sup>. But far the greater number held a resurrection of the bodies both of the just and of the unjust, in order to judgment. Rabbi Eliezer Kapernaita says, those that are born shall die, those that are dead shall be raised, and those that are raised to life again shall be judged<sup>r</sup>. And that famous argument made use of by Gabika Ben Cosem, to prove the resurrection of the dead, fully shews that they expected the same body; “That which was not, came into being; and “shall not that much more which has been already<sup>s</sup>?” The Talmudists also make use of that text, Dan. xii. 2, 3. to prove the resurrection<sup>t</sup>: *And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt*. What can be said to sleep in the dust of the earth but the body? This text therefore is alleged by them to prove that there shall be a resurrection of the bodies both of the just and the unjust.

And that the resurrection of the same body was a doctrine wherewith the ancient Jews, long before our Saviour’s time, comforted, supported, and encouraged themselves under the hardships of persecution, is fully evident from 2 Maccab. vii. 9. 11. 14. 23. 29. 36. and xiii. 43, 44. In the account

<sup>q</sup> Chetuboth. fol. 3. Vid. Sixt. Sen. Bib. San. l. 2. tit. T. fin.

<sup>r</sup> Pirke aboth, cap. 4. Vid. Seld. de Jur. Nat. l. 7. c. 9. fin. p. 745. <sup>s</sup> Juchasin, f. 13. Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 655.

<sup>t</sup> Sanhed. Vid. Poli Synop. in loc. et Hontingii Not. in Surenhusii Mishna Rosh hashana, p. 314.

there given of the sufferings of the seven sons, the second says, *The King of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, unto everlasting life.* The third son, holding forth his hands, says, *These members I had from Heaven, and for his laws I despise them, and from him I hope to receive them again.* The fourth son, *It is good, being put to death by men, to look for hope from God, to be raised up again by him.* As for thee, speaking to Antiochus, *thou shalt have no resurrection to life, that is, to an everlasting, happy life.* The mother says to the seventh son, *Take thy death, that I may receive thee again in mercy with thy brethren.*

This doctrine of the same body's being raised is evidently implied in the question which is asked by the Sadducees concerning the resurrection, *Whose wife shall she be of the seven? for the seven had her to wife*<sup>u</sup>. There cannot be the least doubt made but that the case they put was formed upon the common hypothesis or doctrine of the Pharisees. If that doctrine had been the transmigration of souls only, the case put, and the question raised upon it, would have been so far from puzzling the Pharisees, that it would not have carried the least appearance of difficulty with it. The case plainly supposes that the seven husbands and the wife were all to arise from the dead together, and to arise in the same bodies, so as to be known one to the other: and the difficulty lay in determining to which of these husbands she should belong in the life of pleasure they were to lead together after the resurrection. For

<sup>u</sup> Matt. xxii. 28.



it is very evident from the Talmudists, who are the true successors of the Pharisees, that they expected to enjoy the same sensual delights after the resurrection, as men do now upon this earth, though in a larger degree<sup>x</sup>. Having such notions, the question asked contained an insuperable difficulty, noways to be resolved by them; which probably was the true reason why some among them explained away the doctrine of the resurrection, and placed the Pythagorean transmigration of souls in its room.

The Sadducees on the other hand admitted not of a resurrection or reviviscence of the dead taken in any sense, nor allowed so much as the existence of angels or unembodied spirits. Josephus expressly says, "The Sadducees reject the permanence or existence of the soul after death, and the rewards and punishments of an invisible world<sup>y</sup>:" and in another place, "The Sadducees hold that souls perish with the bodies<sup>z</sup>:" and it is evident from the opposition he all along puts between the opinions of the Pharisees and those of the Sadducees, that they meant, the soul so perished, as not to be capable of any resurrection or reviviscence; not that it fell into a state of inactivity, out of which it might be awakened, but that it totally and irrecoverably perished. The Talmudists and other Jewish writers, in exact agreement herewith, tell us, that the Sadducees denied rewards and punishments after death, denied the age or world to come, and the resurrection of the dead<sup>a</sup>. The Sadducees, writes one of them, cavil and say, the cloud faileth, and passeth away;

<sup>x</sup> Light. vol. 2. p. 552. Grot. in Matt. xxii. 28.

<sup>y</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 8. §. 14.

<sup>z</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 4.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 125. 126. 699. 700.

so he that goeth down to the grave doth not return <sup>b</sup>.

It has been admired by some learned men that they should deny the existence of angels, when on all hands it is agreed that they acknowledged the five books of Moses, wherein is such frequent and express mention made of the appearance and ministry of angels. To this it is answered, that they believed not the angels spoken of in the books of Moses to be of any duration, but looked on them as beings created only for the service they performed, and existing no longer <sup>c</sup>. There seem to have been heretics in Justin Martyr's time of an opinion near akin to this <sup>d</sup>: and it is plain, that some among the Jews retained this notion as low down as the emperor Justinian's time. For there is a law of his extant, published against those Jews who should presume, *aut resurrectionem et judicium negare, aut facturam Dei et creaturam angelos subsistere*, "either to deny the resurrection and judgment, or "that angels, the workmanship and creatures of "God, did subsist <sup>e</sup>."

Since these two sects differed so widely in matters of such great concernment as the separate existence of the soul, rewards and punishments in a future state, and a resurrection or return to life, it is but reasonable to suppose that there should be frequent jars and contentions between them. Accordingly, when Josephus tells us that the Sadducees rejected what the Pharisees introduced from

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 230. Tanchum. f. 3. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Grot. in Matt. xxii. xxiii. &c. Light. vol. 2. p. 702. Whitby on Acts xxiii. 8. and Matt. xxii. 23. Basnage in Eccles. Pol. Ann. 78. 5. <sup>d</sup> Dial. cum Tryp. p. 358. b. <sup>e</sup> Nov. 146. cap. 2.

tradition, he adds, "Concerning these things have " happened great disputes and differences between " them<sup>f</sup>." St. Paul, who well knew this, *seeing that one part of the council were Pharisees and the other Sadducees*, improved the opportunity to set them at variance, that he might the more easily escape their censure<sup>g</sup>.

Although it was so well known by the apostle that the whole sect of the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead, yet he scruples not to say, *To which promise*, that is, the promise made of God to our fathers of a resurrection to eternal life, *our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come<sup>h</sup>*. For the Sadducees were so few in number, that they were not worthy his notice by way of exception. Josephus expressly tells us, "That they were a few men only of the chief of " their nation<sup>i</sup>; that they prevailed only with the " rich to embrace their sentiments; that the com- " mon people were all on the side of the Pharisees<sup>k</sup>." That the ancient Jews believed the resurrection to life to be part of the covenant God had made with their fathers, is evident from the place we have before referred to in the second book of Maccabees. The Jewish martyrs not only die in the hope of a resurrection to everlasting life, but they plainly found this hope upon God's covenant. For the youngest of the seven sons says, *Our brethren, who now have suffered a short pain, are dead under God's covenant of everlasting life<sup>l</sup>*.

Josephus says of the Pharisees, that they were

<sup>f</sup> Antiq. l. 13. c. 10. §. 6.

<sup>g</sup> Acts xxiii. 6.

<sup>h</sup> Acts xxvi. 7.

<sup>i</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 4.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. l. 13. c. 10. §. 6. et c. 15. §. ult. <sup>l</sup> 2 Maccab. vii. 36.

more pious than the other Jews; by which he means, that they were more tenacious of the Jewish laws and customs: and they are represented in the history of the Acts as continuing to be such even after they had received and professed the gospel: *There arose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise the believing Gentiles, and to command them to keep the law of Moses<sup>m</sup>.*

It is remarkable, that as we find the Pharisees to be the most forward and zealous against our Lord, during his ministry, in the four Gospels, so the Sadducees, we find, are the most active against his disciples in the history of the Acts. The reason is plain; it was the Pharisees chiefly whom our Lord reproved. He condemned their impious traditions, detected their hypocrisy, and laid open their vile and wicked practices: this made them so warm against him. On the other hand, the disciples preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead. This enraged the Sadducees; and for this they would have contrived means to put them to death, had it not been for the milder counsel of Gamaliel the Pharisee<sup>n</sup>. They would have done the same afterwards by St. Paul, had he not been favoured by the Pharisees<sup>o</sup>. Josephus represents the Sadducees as of a rude, savage, inconvertible temper; and says, they are, above all the Jews, cruel in the sentences they pass. On the other hand, he says, the Pharisees are by nature mild in their punishments<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> Acts xv. 5.

<sup>n</sup> Acts iv. 1, 2. and v. 17. 33.

<sup>o</sup> Acts xxiii. 9.

<sup>p</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 8. §. 14. Antiq. l. 20.

c. 8. §. 1. l. 13. c. 10. §. 6. p. 587.

§. 4. When it is said, Acts vi. 9, *There arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and them of Cilicia and Asia, disputing with Stephen*; this, as I apprehend it, is distinguishing the Jews according to the places they usually inhabited. The Talmudists tell us there were four hundred and sixty; some of them say, four hundred and eighty synagogues in Jerusalem<sup>q</sup>. It is very probable that many of these were built by the Jews of particular countries for their own use. There is mention made in the Talmud of the synagogue of Alexandria, and it is there said that the Alexandrians built it at their own expense<sup>r</sup>. In like manner, it is probable, there was a synagogue for the use of the Jews that ordinarily inhabited Cyrene, one also for those that dwelt in Cilicia, and another for those whose abode was in Asia Minor: that the Jews were numerous in those countries is abundantly evident from Philo<sup>s</sup>, Dio<sup>t</sup>, Josephus<sup>u</sup>. The Libertines, I take it, were no other than the Roman Jews, or Jews who ordinarily had their residence at Rome, and were free of that city: that very great numbers of the Jews, who had been taken captives by the Romans, and were carried into Italy, had obtained their liberty, is clear from Philo<sup>x</sup> and Tacitus<sup>y</sup>.

<sup>q</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 363. fin. vol. 2. 664. Grot. in Act. vi. 9.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 665.      <sup>s</sup> Leg. ad Caium, p. 1031. e. et in Flaccum, p. 971, c.      <sup>t</sup> L. 68. p. 786.      <sup>u</sup> Antiq. l. 16. c. 6. §. 1. 5. l. 12. c. 3. §. 1, 2. l. 14. c. 10. §. 12, &c. l. 16. c. 2. §. 3. Tully pro Flacco, n. 28. vol. 1. p. 493.      <sup>x</sup> Legat. ad Caium, p. 1014, D.      <sup>y</sup> Annal. l. 2. 85. fin. "Quatuor millia "libertini generis ea superstitione infecta, quibus idonea ætas, in "Sardiniam veherentur." Let this be compared with what Suetonius says in Tib. 36. 2. and Joseph. Antiq. l. 18. c. 4. §. ult. fin.



## CHAP. V.

*Shewing how far the Jewish customs referred to are confirmed by other authors.*

I PROCEED now to the third thing, which is to shew how far the customs and manners referred to in the book of Acts are confirmed by other writers, and this, whether they be Jewish, Grecian, or Roman. I shall begin with the Jewish, and consider the other two in their order.

§. 1. Although it is certain that, by the divine appointment, and the custom of the Jewish nation, there was properly but one high priest at a time in that nation, yet is there frequent mention made in the Acts of the holy Apostles of high priests, as being many, at one and the same time<sup>z</sup>. We meet with the same way of speaking very often in the History of Josephus. He tells us how very much the high priests oppressed the priests in taking away their tithes<sup>a</sup>. He names one, whom he calls the oldest of the high priests<sup>b</sup>; another, whom he terms the youngest of the high priests<sup>c</sup>; and blames Herod, for that he had given the high priesthood to certain obscure persons, who were of the priests only, meaning that he ought to have taken them from among the high priests<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>z</sup> Acts iv. 23. v. 24. ix. 14. 21. xxii. 30. xxiii. 14. xxv. 15. and xxvi. 10. 13.      <sup>a</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 8. and c. 8. §. 2.

<sup>b</sup> De Bell. l. 4. c. 3. §. 7. and c. 4. §. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Vit. §. 39. p. 923. l. 35.

<sup>d</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 9. p. 901. l. 25. Vid. de Bell. l. 1. c. 1. §. 1. et l. 2. c. 14. §. 8. et c. 15. §. 2. 3. 4. 6. et c. 16. §. 2. 3. et c. 17. §. 2. 3. 5. 6. et c. 20. §. 4. et l. 4. c. 3. §. 9. et c. 4. §. 3. 4. et



From the time that Herod the Great obtained the kingdom, the high priests were not permitted to enjoy their office for life, according to the Mosaic institution, but were turned out, and others put in their room; generally after a few years, sometimes after having held the dignity a few months only, according to the interest or caprice of those who governed. All who had been once high priests retained the name ever after. Hence it came to pass that during the period we are treating of many were living together who had executed this high office.

This however is thought by learned men not to be a sufficient ground for the use of the expressions before us<sup>e</sup>. It is observed by some of them, that the Talmudists speak much of a *sagan*, or vice high priest, and say that there were under him two *kathilokin*, or principal overseers of the treasures; and under them seven *immerkalin*, who kept the keys of the seven gates of the court of the temple; and under these three *gisbarin*, or under-treasurers. Besides these were the heads or chiefs of the twenty-four courses of priests appointed by David. All these are supposed to go under the name of ἀρχιερεῖς<sup>f</sup>, or high priests, both in the New Testament and the History of Josephus. The learned Dr. Lightfoot seems to think that not only the twenty-four chiefs of the courses, but that all the heads of the

c. 5. §. 2. p. 1183. l. 11. et §. 5. p. 1185. l. 22. et c. 9. §. 11. p. 1201. l. 42. et l. 5. c. 13. §. 1. et l. 6. c. 2. §. 2. et c. 9. §. 3. Vit. §. 2. p. 905. pr. et §. 5. p. 906. l. 11. et p. 923. l. 16. 35.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Grot. in Matt. ii. 4. et Hudson. Not. in Joseph. de Bell. l. 4. c. 5. §. 2. et Antiq. l. 20. c. 6. §. 8.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 3. c. 8. §. 6. et de Success. in Pontif. c. 12. p. 139, 140. Light. vol. 1. p. 911—918.

families in each course, and that all the priests who were at any time chosen into the sanhedrim, or great council, went under the name of ἀρχιερεῖς, or chief priests<sup>g</sup>. Even in the Old Testament we read of Zephaniah the second priest<sup>h</sup>, which is understood by learned men of the *sagan* or vice high priest<sup>i</sup>, spoken of in the Jewish writers; and is so interpreted by the Chaldee paraphrast on the place. We also read of priests of the second order<sup>k</sup>, which is understood of the *sagan*, and those priests who were next to him in office and dignity. And in another part of the Old Testament it is said, *Col sarei cohanim*<sup>l</sup>, “All the princes or chiefs of the priests have transgressed.” And long before this, in the time of David, when they were first divided into courses, there is mention made of *the chiefs of the fathers of the priests*<sup>m</sup>, translated by the Septuagint ἀρχοντες τῶν πατριῶν τῶν ἱερέων, the princes or governors of the families of the priests. The manner of expression before us seems therefore to be much more ancient than the reign of Herod, and to be derived down from the times of the Old Testament.

§. 2. There is no one who reads the history of the Acts but must immediately see that the high priests were at the head of affairs in the Jewish nation. The same thing is equally evident to every one who peruses Josephus’s History of the Jewish Wars<sup>n</sup>. He seldom mentions ἀρχιερεῖς, or the chief

<sup>g</sup> Vol. 1. p. 439. vol. 2. p. 109, 110.

<sup>h</sup> 2 Kings xxv. 18.

Jer. lii. 24.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Grot. et Patrick on 2 Kings xxv. 18.

<sup>k</sup> 2 Kings xxiii. 4. Vid. Grot. et Patrick in loc.

<sup>l</sup> 2 Chron.

xxxvi. 14: in the LXX. indeed there is another reading.

<sup>m</sup> 1 Chron. xxiv. 6. 31. Raschei haaboth haccohanim.

<sup>n</sup> Vid.

et contr. Apion. l. 2. §. 21. fin. et Antiq. l. 4. c. 18. §. 14. fin.

priests, but he joins them with οἱ δυνατοὶ<sup>ο</sup>, τὸ γνωριμώτατον<sup>ρ</sup>, ἄλλοι εὐγενεῖς, οἱ πρῶτοι<sup>η</sup>, οἱ προεστῶτες τοῦ πλήθους<sup>ι</sup>, or ἡ βουλὴ<sup>ς</sup>, that is, those who had the greatest authority in the nation. It fully appears also from the Talmud that the priests made up a great part of the sanhedrim, or supreme council, of the Jewish nation<sup>τ</sup>.

The members of this council, according to the Acts and the four Gospels, were the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes<sup>υ</sup>. The Talmudical writers tell us that all the members of the council were ordained elders<sup>χ</sup>: and from various sayings of the same writers it appears that they esteemed them all to be Scribes<sup>γ</sup>. The general signification of the

<sup>ο</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 14. §. 8. et c. 15. §. 2. et c. 17. §. 3. 5.

<sup>ρ</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 14. §. 8. et c. 15. §. 3, 4. et c. 17. §. 2.

<sup>η</sup> Vit. §. 2. p. 905. pr. et c. 5. p. 906. l. 11.

<sup>ι</sup> Vit. p. 923.

l. 16.

<sup>ς</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 15. §. 6. et c. 16. §. 2.

<sup>τ</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 282. vol. 2. p. 469. Grot. in Matt. v. 22. p. 43. f. et 45. Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 8. §. 3. p. 1403. Herod, it is true, slew all the members of the sanhedrim who sat in judgment upon him under Hyrcanus excepting Sameas. Antiq. l. 14. c. 9. §. 4. et l. 15. c. 1. §. 1. But it noways follows from thence that he discontinued that court. Had he made so great an alteration in the government, doubtless Josephus would have informed us of it. That it continued under the Romans is evident from various places in Josephus. The letter of the emperor Claudius is directed to them, Antiq. l. 20. c. 1. §. 2. Florus the governor sent for them, de Bell. l. 2. c. 15. §. 6; and they are mentioned again, c. 16. §. 2.

<sup>υ</sup> Acts iv. 5, 6. 15. v. 21. 24. vi. 12. and xxii. 5. Luke xxii. 66. Mark xv. 1. Matt. xxvi. 59.

<sup>χ</sup> Vid. Seld. de Syn. l. 1. c. 14. p. 1088. l. 2. c. 7. p. 1331. de Uxor. Heb. l. 1. c. 15. Eutych. Orig. p. 436. Light. vol. i. p. 612. vol. 2. p. 755.

<sup>γ</sup> Vid. Seld. de Jur. Nat. l. 4. c. 8. p. 476. Light. vol. 2. p. 110. and 422. vol. 1. p. 654.

word Scribes among them is, men learned in their law<sup>z</sup>. Now forasmuch as this learning was a necessary qualification in order to the being admitted members of the sanhedrim<sup>a</sup>, what must be meant by the word Scribes as distinguished from that of Elders? The learned Grotius, to avoid the difficulty of this question, will not allow them to be properly members of the sanhedrim, but only assessors<sup>b</sup>, men of approved learning, who were present in the sanhedrim to give their opinion when matters of a more nice and intricate nature lay before them, but had no voice in the determining or judicial part. Our countryman Dr. Lightfoot understands by Scribes sometimes those members of the sanhedrim who kept divinity schools, and were public teachers of their law<sup>c</sup>; at other times those members, who although not high priests, yet were of the tribe of Levi<sup>d</sup>. The last opinion seems to me the most probable. This exactly agrees with the description of the sanhedrim as restored by good king Jehoshaphat, 2Chron. xix. 8. *Moreover in Jerusalem did Jehoshaphat set of the Levites, and of the priests, and of the chief of the fathers of Israel, for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies.* The chief of the fathers of

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 421, 422.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 6. §. 3. p. 1324, 1325. et c. 7. §. 2. p. 1336, 1337. et c. 9. §. 1. pr. and were called rabbi or teachers, vid. p. 1333, 1335, 1347, 1373.

<sup>b</sup> In Matt. ii. 4. p. 17. b. 12. and 16, 21. p. 164. a. 25. and in Acts iv. 5. p. 588, b. 3. Of such assessors see Light. vol. 2. p. 422, who seems to give into this opinion, p. 652. And of the assessors to the courts of Twenty-three, see Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 6. §. 2. p. 1321, 1322.

<sup>c</sup> Vol. 1. p. 654.

<sup>d</sup> Vol. 1. p. 439. fin. and p. 760. and vol. 2. p. 469.

Israel answer to the Elders, and the Levites to the Scribes. The Levites, having a tenth part of the product of the land given them for their subsistence, were more at leisure to study the law than the other tribes. That very great numbers of them made proficiency herein we have no reason to doubt, since we read that in David's time no less than six thousand of this tribe were officers and judges<sup>e</sup>. The most learned therefore being usually of this tribe, and there being few in comparison who attained to any considerable knowledge of the law in the other tribes, it is probable the word Scribes when mentioned alone was understood of them; and when it was intended to speak of the learned men of the other tribes it was used with the addition of the word *people*, as Matt. ii. 4. *the Scribes of the people*. The prophet Moses, foreseeing that the priests and Levites would be the most skilful in the law he had delivered, directs the people to them for the final determination of their more difficult causes; Deut. xvii. 9. From which text Maimonides collects that the priests and Levites were by the divine order principally intended to be members of the great council; but if such are not to be found, although they were all Israelites, it is allowed<sup>f</sup>.

§. 3. We read in the history of the Acts that the members of the Jewish sanhedrim, or great council, were of different sects; that there were both Pharisees and Sadducees who composed this council<sup>g</sup>: that there should be of the pharisaic sect is but natural to suppose, when Josephus informs us that

<sup>e</sup> 1 Chron. xxiii. 4.

<sup>f</sup> In Sanhed. c. 2. Vid. Light. vol. 2.

p. 469. Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 8. §. 2. p. 1397, &c.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. xxiii. 6. See also ch. iv. 1, 6. and v. 17.



the multitude of the Jewish nation were their followers, and under their influence<sup>h</sup>. And when he tells us that the Sadducees were of the wealthiest<sup>i</sup> and chief men for dignity<sup>k</sup>, and that whenever they were in the government they were forced to yield to the dictates of the Pharisees through fear of the multitude<sup>l</sup>, this evidently proves that there might also be, and probably were, many Sadducees sitting in this council. And the Talmudists expressly tell us that there was once a sanhedrim made up chiefly, if not wholly, of Sadducees<sup>m</sup>.

§. 4. It is said, Acts v. 17, that *the high priest rose up, and all they that were with him, which is the sect of the Sadducees*. From hence, together with what is said in the foregoing chapter, the learned Grotius concludes that the high priest and his kindred were at this time of the sect of the Sadducees. This follows not by any necessary consequence from the expressions here used; but it is not a little probable that it was so in fact. That there were high priests of this sect is evident both from Josephus and the Talmud. In the latter is related the great caution used, lest the high priest on the great day of expiation should administer after the manner of the Sadducees<sup>n</sup>: according to the former, Hyrcanus and his sons Aristobulus and Alexander were high priests of the sect of the<sup>o</sup>Sad-

<sup>h</sup> Antiq. l. 13. c. 10. §. 5, 6.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. l. 18.

c. 1. §. 4.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid.

<sup>m</sup> Sanhed. f. 52. 1. Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 571. Vitring. de Syn. vet. l. 1. c. 7. p. 160.

<sup>n</sup> Joma, c. 1. §. 5. Vid. notas in Surenhusii Mishna. Seld. de Syn. l. 3. c. 11. §. 2. p. 1687, 1688. Light. vol. 1. p. 655. and Megil. f. 24. quoted by him.

<sup>o</sup> Antiq. l. 13. c. 10. §. 6. et c. 15. §. 5.

ducees. He also tells us that Ananus the high priest was of this sect<sup>q</sup>. He was the son of Annas the high priest, mentioned both in the Gospels and the book of Acts; which Annas had five sons, who were all raised to the high priesthood<sup>r</sup>, as was also his son-in-law Caiaphas. It was during the high priesthood of this Caiaphas that passed the transactions we have referred to as mentioned in the fourth and fifth chapters of the Acts: and it is very probable that Annas himself, and each of his sons, together with his son-in-law Caiaphas, were favourers of the Sadducees, if not professedly of that sect. It is true, Josephus does not assert of any of them that they were Sadducees, excepting Ananus; but he had not the same occasion given him, when speaking of them, to say of what sect they were, as he had when speaking of Ananus.

§. 5. We learn from the Talmudists that Gamaliel succeeded his father Simeon as president of the sanhedrim, and continued in that office till within eighteen years of the destruction of Jerusalem<sup>s</sup>: and by what is related of him in the fifth chapter of the Acts it evidently appears that he was a person of no small weight and influence in the Jewish council. St. Paul, speaking of himself, says, that he was educated at Jerusalem under Gamaliel<sup>t</sup>: and it is very certain, if the Talmud may be at all believed, that the president and vice-president of the sanhedrim were the most eminent teachers of the law<sup>u</sup>. St. Paul's words are, that he was *brought*

<sup>q</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Id. ibid. and John xviii. 13.

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 278. 765. 2009. vol. 2. p. 15.

<sup>t</sup> Acts xxii. 3.

<sup>u</sup> See what Light. says of Antigonus of Socho, vol. 1. p. 457.

*up at the feet of Gamaliel.* There has been a dispute among learned men concerning the meaning of this phrase<sup>x</sup>. Far the greater part, I think, look upon it as an allusion to the posture or situation of the scholar while he was learning, which they describe as sitting at the feet of his master. There lies but one objection to this, as far as I have been able to find; and that is, a tradition of the Talmud, “that from the days of Moses to Rabban Gamaliel they learned the law standing; but when Rabban Gamaliel died, the world languished, so that they learnt the law sitting<sup>y</sup>.” To avoid the force of this objection, the learned Grotius understands the tradition in this limited sense, that whilst the words of the law itself were read, they all stood; but whilst the masters discoursed from those words, or gave them lessons, they all sat<sup>z</sup>. While the words of the law were read, both masters and scholars all stood. Thus Ezra and all the people stood, while the book of the law was open<sup>a</sup>. Thus our Saviour, when in the synagogue of Nazareth, while he read, was standing; but when he had delivered back the book to the minister he sat down, and preached or instructed the people<sup>b</sup>: and Josephus tells us, that the

vol. 2. p. 699. and 700; of Shemaiah and Abtalion, p. 2008; of Hillel and Shammai, vol. 1. p. 207. 514. 2008. vol. 2. 206, 207. Vitrin. de Synag. vet. l. 1. p. 1. c. 7. p. 158, &c. Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 4. §. 10. et c. 16. §. 10. De Uxor. Heb. c. 20. p. 769, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Vitrin. de Synag. vet. l. 1. p. 1. c. 7. p. 168.

<sup>y</sup> Megil. f. 21, 1. Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 619. vol. 2. p. 395, 6. et Vitrin. de Synag. vet. l. 1. p. 1. c. 7. p. 166, 167.

<sup>z</sup> In Acts xxii. 3.

<sup>a</sup> Neh. viii. 5.

<sup>b</sup> Luke iv. 17.

Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 405. fin. 406. and vol. 1. p. 614.

high priest at the end of every seven years stood and read the law to the people <sup>c</sup>.

Maimonides, it is true, understands this tradition in a more extensive sense; that learners stood, not only while the words of the law were read, but during the whole time that they were under instruction <sup>d</sup>. But is it not possible he might be misled by the modern practice of the Jews, which is, to sit as well when the words of the law are read as when they have any instructive discourses made to them? might he not hence too hastily conclude that they stood during both, before the alteration was made?

There are several phrases in the Old Testament, which seem plainly to refer to this custom of scholars sitting at the feet of their teachers <sup>e</sup>. There is a saying also in the Talmud itself, ascribed to Joses the son of Joezer, who was president of the sanhedrim three hundred years before Gamaliel's death <sup>f</sup>, which many of the Jewish masters expound to this sense; and indeed it will not easily bear any other. The saying is, "Let thy house be an house of assembly for wise men, and dust thyself in the dust of their feet, and drink their words with thirst <sup>g</sup>."

Maimonides tells us it was not the custom in their schools for the master to sit in a chair, and the scholars to sit on the ground, but that either all

<sup>c</sup> Antiq. l. 4. c. 8. §. 12. prin. p. 162.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Vit. de Syn. vet. l. 1. p. 1. c. 7. p. 166.

<sup>e</sup> Gen. xlix. 10. Deut. xxxiii. 3. 2 Kings ii. 3. See Patrick on that text, and on 2 Kings iv. 38.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 2008. Prid. Conn. vol. 2. p. 53.

<sup>g</sup> Vid. Vit. de Synag. vet. l. 1. p. 1. c. 7. p. 168, 169.

sat on the ground or all in chairs<sup>b</sup>: that it was not always thus is fully evident from the Talmud; for Rabbi Eleazer ben Shamma being asked how he came to that great age, answered, I never walked upon the heads of the holy people<sup>i</sup>. The gloss is, upon the heads of his disciples sitting upon the ground: and it is said of Rabbi Rabb that he would not sit upon his bed and read to his scholar while he sat upon the ground. The gloss is, either both should be on the bed or both on the ground<sup>k</sup>. These sayings fully intimate that other masters, if not the generality of masters, had done otherwise: whence else arises the praise and commendation given to the persons here spoken of? But that which, I think, fully confirms the matter to us, is what Maimonides himself relates concerning their judicial courts of Twenty-three. In all which, he says, were three orders of disciples sitting one beneath the other<sup>l</sup>. Now if they sat thus beneath each other, and consequently beneath their masters in their courts of judicature, wherein they were properly assessors, and upon difficult causes were ordained and removed to the bench itself: I say, if they sat beneath their masters in the courts of judicature, can it be doubted that they sat beneath them also in their schools? Philo also, giving an account of the Essenes, says, "When they come into the holy places, that are called synagogues, they sit in ranks according to their different ages, the younger

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Vit. *ibid.* p. 166.

<sup>i</sup> See this explained from the Babylonian Talmud, Sanhed. f. 7. 2. by Light. vol. 2. p. 135, fin.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 396.

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 2. 6. §. 2. p. 1322.



“under the elder<sup>m</sup>.” Upon the whole therefore I cannot but conclude that what is delivered to us by Pseudo-Ambrosius, in his Commentary upon the First Epistle to the Corinthians, as a Jewish tradition, was the real fact; “That in their schools “the seniors in dignity sat in chairs, the next to “them on inferior benches, and the last of all upon “mats laid on the ground<sup>n</sup>.”

§. 6. There is an officer named in the history of the Acts στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ: we translate it, *captain of the temple*<sup>o</sup>. He is spoken of as forward and busy in apprehending the disciples. Dr. Lightfoot in one part of his works<sup>p</sup> takes this to be a Roman officer, who had the command of the guard in the tower of Antonia, which, as Josephus informs us, were upon all feast-days placed in the porch of the temple, to prevent tumults, and preserve peace; and several learned men went before him in this opinion. But there is one thing in the text which in my mind is wholly inconsistent herewith: the persons under the command of this captain are not called soldiers, but ministers, ὑπηρέται: we indeed have translated it *officers*; *Then went the captain with the officers, and brought them without violence*. The word never signifies military officers, but civil, the officers of justice. Besides, what should make the Romans so zealous in apprehending the apostles? In another part of his works therefore the doctor rejects this opinion as improbable, and tells us<sup>q</sup> from the Talmud that in three places the priests

<sup>m</sup> Quod omnis probus liber, p. 877. D.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Vit. de Synag. vet. p. 169. fin. et Grot. in Act. xxii. 3.

<sup>o</sup> Ch. iv. 1. and v. 24, 26. <sup>p</sup> Vol. 1. p. 759. 1060.

<sup>q</sup> Vol. 2. p. 471. 651.

kept watch and ward in the temple, the Levites in one and twenty places more. Each of these watches had a captain or head over them, and he that had the command of all these watches, called in the Talmud the ruler of the mountain of the house or temple, is probably the person styled here *the captain of the temple*; and στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, or *the captains of the temple*, mentioned in St. Luke's gospel<sup>r</sup>, might be the chief captain, together with those who were next him in command.

Nor is Josephus wholly silent concerning this officer. He does not indeed name him στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, but he mentions two persons, Ananus and Eliezer, both sons of Ananias, who was one of the wealthiest and most powerful of all those who had executed the office of high priest; each of these he terms στρατηγὸς<sup>s</sup>, and it is fully evident from what he says of the one of them that his command lay wholly in the temple. The words of Josephus are, “Eliezer the son of Ananias the high priest, κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν στρατηγῶν τότε, performing at that time in the temple the office of ὁ στρατηγὸς, being at that time the chief commanding officer in the temple, prevailed with those who performed the divine service not to receive the offering or sacrifice of any foreigner. This was the foundation of the war with the Romans; for they rejected the sacrifice of Cæsar for them: and although the chief priests and great men interceded much with them not to omit the custom of sacrificing for their governors, they would not yield, trusting much to their num-

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xxii. 4, 52.

<sup>s</sup> Antiq. l. 10. c. 5. §. 2. et c. 8. §. 3. de Bell. l. 2. c. 12. §. 6. et c. 17. §. 2.

“bers ; but especially because of the regard they “ had to Eliezer ὁ στρατηγός, the chief commanding “ officer.” As the temple is the place where he is expressly said to have executed his office, so it is plain that his sway and influence lay among the people there<sup>t</sup>.

§. 7. It appears to any one who reads the history of the Acts, that the Jews had synagogues or places of worship in almost every city which they inhabited, whether in the land of Judæa or out of it : and that in large cities, where there were many Jews, they had more than one, as particularly in Jerusalem<sup>u</sup>, Damascus<sup>x</sup>, and Salamis<sup>y</sup>. The practice of the Jews at this time in all nations where they are tolerated, together with the reason and nature of the thing, might here suffice, although there were nothing left to confirm this in any ancient authors extant. But we have abundant proof of the truth of this representation, not only from Josephus, who mentions various synagogues of the Jews as well in foreign cities as in their own, but from Philo, who, as in one part of his works he tells us that there were Jews inhabiting most of the cities in the provinces of Europe and Asia, and that they had synagogues in every place<sup>z</sup>, so in another says there were many synagogues in every division of the city of Alexandria<sup>a</sup>; and from the poet Juvenal, who in those words, “ In qua te quæro pros- “ eucha<sup>b</sup>,” plainly intimates that there were several

<sup>t</sup> Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxvi. 45. et Basnage Annal. Pol. Eccles.

p. 439. §. 9.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. vi. 9.

<sup>x</sup> Ch. ix. 2. 20.

<sup>y</sup> Ch. xiii. 5.

<sup>z</sup> In Flaccum, p. 971. D. et 972.

<sup>a</sup> In Leg. ad Caium, p. 1011. a. Τῶν προσευχῶν πολλαὶ δὲ εἰς καθ' ἑκάστον τμήμα τῆς πόλεως.

<sup>b</sup> Sat. 3. v. 296.

Jewish synagogues in the city of Rome. The Talmudists tell us that there were four hundred and eighty in Jerusalem<sup>c</sup>, four hundred at Bither<sup>d</sup>, thirteen at Tiberias<sup>e</sup>, eighteen at Zippor<sup>f</sup>. And Maimonides lays it down as an ancient tradition, that in every place where there were ten Israelites, who were of age, and were free, they were constrained to build a synagogue<sup>g</sup>.

§. 8. Of these synagogues were certain rulers in chief, called, in the history of the Acts and in the Gospels, ἀρχισυνάγωγοι. There were often several of these to one synagogue; for when Paul and Barnabas were in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, it is said, οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, *the chief rulers of the synagogue sent unto them*<sup>h</sup>: and St. Mark says of Jairus, who dwelt at Capernaum, where in all probability there was but one synagogue, that he was εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων<sup>i</sup>: and both Crispus and Sos-

<sup>c</sup> Gemara Megill. Hierosol. ad cap. 3. fol. 73. col. 4. Vid. Vit. de Syn. vet. Prol. cap. 4. p. 28. and Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 35. and 664.

<sup>d</sup> Bab Gemara ad tit. Gittin, c. 6. fol. 58. 1. Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 7. §. 6. p. 1351, fin. et Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. in voc. Cheneseth, p. 1056, pr.

<sup>e</sup> Bab Berach, fol. 30. 2. Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 72, fin.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 75, pr.

<sup>g</sup> Hilcoth Tephilla, c. 11. §. 1. Vid. Vit. de Synag. vet. l. 1. p. 2. c. 12. p. 232. et Seld. de Syned. l. 3. c. 16. §. 1. p. 1883, fin. where are many other masters quoted to the same purpose. Dr. Lightfoot understands this of ten Batlanin, men of leisure or learning, three of which, he says, were always ordained elders or judges, and were properly οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι; vol. 2. p. 132, 133. 179. 755. and vol. 1. p. 610. Compare what he says, vol. 2. p. 638. with Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 5. §. 4. p. 1313, 1314.

<sup>h</sup> Acts xiii. 15.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. v. 22; for John vi. 59. it is said, Ταῦτα εἶπεν ἐν συναγωγῇ,

thenes are named in the Acts of the Apostles as being each ἀρχισυνάγωγος at Corinth<sup>k</sup>; but that being a large and populous city, it is very possible there might be more synagogues than one in it: whether they belonged therefore to one and the same synagogue is altogether uncertain. That there were officers among the Jews who went under this name is evident from the emperor Adrian's letter to Servianus the consul, preserved by Vopiscus<sup>l</sup>; from the reproach thrown upon the emperor Alexander Severus, reported by Lampridius, who says he was called *archisynagogus*, being a Syrian by nation, and being thought to favour the Jewish and Christian religions<sup>m</sup>; and from several rescripts in the Theodosian code which make express mention of these officers among the Jews<sup>n</sup>.

Some of these laws explain to us who these *archisynagogi* were: *archisynagogi sive presbyteri Judæorum*<sup>o</sup>. They were the elders of the Jews; and this exactly agrees with what the Talmudical and other Jewish writers tell us; that their ordained elders, as they were the judges in their courts of judicature, so they were the masters in their schools,

διδάσκων ἐν Καπερναοῦμ, not ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν, as Luke xiii. 10. Vid. Vit. de Synag. vet. l. 2. c. 11. p. 583, 584. et Grot. in Matt. ix. 18.

<sup>k</sup> Acts xviii. 8. 17. Vid. Grot. in loc. et Vit. ubi supra.

<sup>l</sup> In Saturnino, c. 8. Vid. Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 7. §. 6. p. 1353. Vit. de Synag. vet. l. 2. c. 5. p. 518.

<sup>m</sup> In Alex. Severo, c. 28. Vid. Vit. de Syn. vet. l. 2. c. 5. p. 527. et c. 11. p. 587, 588.

<sup>n</sup> L. 4. de Judæis et Cœlicolis, et l. 2. 13, 14, 15. ejusdem tit. Vid. Vitrin. de Syn. vet. p. 524, 525. 586. 589, 590.

<sup>o</sup> L. 2. et 15. Cod. Theod. de Judæis et Cœlicolis. Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 7. p. 1353.



and the chief rulers in their synagogues<sup>p</sup>. Which lets us into the reason why persons were scourged in their synagogues.

§. 9. The chief rulers of the synagogues being also the judges of the people in many cases, especially those which regarded religion, chose to give sentence against offenders, and see their sentence executed in the synagogue<sup>q</sup>. For punishment being designed *in terrorem*, what more likely way to strike an awe, and deter men from falling into the like errors, than to have it executed in their religious assemblies, and in the face of the congregation? And this accounts for that confusion there is in the Jewish writers when they speak of *beth din* and *beth cheneseth*; their courts of law and their synagogues being often put one for the other<sup>r</sup>. Our Lord foretold that his disciples should be scourged in the synagogues<sup>s</sup>; and St. Paul informs us that he was an instrument in fulfilling this, having beaten them that believed in every synagogue<sup>t</sup>. This of scourging persons in their synagogues is a custom that has prevailed among the Jews from that time down to our own. Uriel Acosta declares, that after he had been excommunicated, this among other conditions of public penance was prescribed him by the chief of the Jews at Amsterdam, that he should re-

<sup>p</sup> Maimon. Hilcoth Taanioth, c. 1. §. 17. Vid. Vit. de Synag. vet. p. 554. 562-3. et 777. Seld. de Syned. l. 1. c. 7. p. 863.

<sup>q</sup> Persons were always scourged in the presence of the judges. Vid. Vit. p. 777. et Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 13. §. 6. p. 1502, fin.

<sup>r</sup> As also their *beth midrash*. Vid. Vit. de Syn. vet. Prol. p. 28. et p. 134-5. 525. 554. 578. 744. 749. Light. vol. 2. p. 135, 136.

<sup>s</sup> Matt. x. 17. and xxiii. 34.

<sup>t</sup> Acts xxii. 19. and xxvi. 11.

ceive forty stripes save one in the synagogue <sup>u</sup>: and Rabbi Jacob ben Asher reports it to have been the custom in Germany that the whole congregation after evening prayer, on the day of expiation, should receive forty stripes in the synagogue by way of penance <sup>x</sup>. Karo says the same, but speaks of it as a more universal practice. And Epiphanius, in the history he gives of Joseph the apostle, expressly says that he was forced away by the Jews into their synagogue, and there scourged <sup>y</sup>.

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Vit. de Syn. vet. l. 3. p. 1. c. 11. p. 776. fin.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 1. c. 7. p. 878.

<sup>y</sup> Contra Hæres. tom. 2. l. 1. p. 135. Vid. Vit. l. 3. c. 11. p. 776.

## CHAP. VI. in two Parts.

PART I. *Shewing that the Jewish magistrates when under the Romans had the power of inflicting capital punishments.*

PART II. *That the jurisdiction of the high priest and council over the Jews in religious matters extended even to foreign cities.*

PART I. *The Introduction.*

ST. PAUL was so eager in harassing the poor Christians, that he not only beat and imprisoned them in Judæa<sup>a</sup>, but persecuted them even to strange cities<sup>b</sup>; and had letters from the high priest and Jewish sanhedrim to the synagogues and brethren at Damascus, that if he found any of that profession there he might bring them bound to Jerusalem for to be punished<sup>c</sup>. It is said that *he breathed out threatenings and slaughter*<sup>d</sup>: that *he persecuted this way unto the death*<sup>e</sup>: and *when the saints were put to death, he gave his voice against them*<sup>f</sup>. There are two things here which offer themselves to our inquiry: the first is, whether the Jews, being at this time under the Roman yoke, had the power of inflicting death or any corporal punishments upon criminals? and, secondly, taking it for granted that they had, how the authority of the high priest and Jewish council could be extended to Damascus or any foreign cities?

Learned men, I find, differ not a little in their

<sup>a</sup> Acts viii. 3. xxii. 4. 19. and xxvi. 10, 11.

<sup>b</sup> Ch. xxvi. 11.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. ix. 2. and xxii. 5.

<sup>d</sup> Acts ix. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Ch. xxii. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. xxvi. 10.

opinions concerning the power left with the Jewish magistrates when their country was made a Roman province. I have met but with two authors who have professedly wrote on this subject. They both maintain the same side of the question. The one is a learned foreigner, Zechariah Huber, advocate and senator<sup>g</sup>; the other our ingenious and learned countryman Mr. Lardner<sup>h</sup>. The reasons urged by these gentlemen are far from giving me satisfaction, and I cannot but think there is much greater probability on the other side of the question. Many authors tell us their opinion on this subject, but add little or nothing to shew upon what foundation they build. The great and learned Grotius says, that with regard to scourging, their power remained safe after Judæa was reduced to a province<sup>i</sup>: in another place, that the power of the sanhedrim was restrained when Judæa was made a province, it being ordained, as in almost all other provinces of the Roman empire, that the senate should put no one to death without the consent of the Roman governor, all other judiciary power belonging to the sanhedrim being preserved to them<sup>k</sup>. It is much to be regretted that he has not given us his authorities for what he here asserts. I am fully persuaded that he was not always of this mind: for in his book *de Jure Belli et Pacis* he has these words; *Sic apud Judæos mansit sceptrum in synedrio etiam post confiscationem Archelai*<sup>l</sup>: “so the sceptre remained among the Jews in the sanhedrim even after the confiscation of Archelaus,”

<sup>g</sup> In a book entitled *Dissertationum Libri Tres*, Dissert. 1. l. 1.

<sup>h</sup> In his *Credibility of the Gospel History*, vol. 1. chap. 2.

<sup>i</sup> In Joann. xviii. 31.

<sup>k</sup> In Matt. v. 22. p. 45. a. l. 35.

<sup>l</sup> L. 3. c. 15. §. 9. p. 851. pr.

i. e. after Judæa was made a Roman province. He is speaking, in the words both before and after this sentence, of the power granted to kings by their conquerors, in which all acknowledge was included *jus gladii*, or the power of taking away the lives of their subjects. He has indeed quoted the Talmudists, as saying that capital judgments were taken away from the sanhedrim forty years<sup>m</sup> before the destruction of Jerusalem<sup>n</sup>. But this by no means comes up to the point: for had they meant that the power of inflicting death was taken away from them by the Romans when their land was made a province, they should have said that capital judgments were taken from the sanhedrim above sixty years before the destruction of Jerusalem: for it was sixty-five years, I think, before that dreadful overthrow that Quirinus was sent by Augustus to confiscate the goods of Archelaus, and reduce his ethnarchy to a Roman province. Let me add to this, that the indefatigable and most learned Selden fully proves from the Talmudical writers that the meaning of this saying is not that capital judgments were wholly taken away, but that they were interrupted, and much disused to what they had formerly been<sup>o</sup>: and I doubt not but this whole dispute had been set by him in the clearest light from the best authorities, had it pleased God to grant him life to have finished what he proposed<sup>p</sup>. Grotius tells us

<sup>m</sup> The learned Wagenseil contends that instead of forty it should be read four years, Carm. R. Lipmanni Confut. p. 312. 318. pr. 326 et 327.

<sup>n</sup> In Matt. v. 22. p. 45. a. l. 41.

<sup>o</sup> De Syned. l. 2. c. 15. §. 11, p. 1560-1-2.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 3. c. 6. §. 4. p. 1654.



from the Jews, that capital judgments were exercised by the sanhedrim after the Babylonish captivity through the grant of the kings of Persia<sup>q</sup>. He might also have informed us, from authors of the same nation, that capital judgments were exercised by the sanhedrim under the Romans.

### SECT. I.

*An answer to the first argument, taken from the civil law.*

THE learned gentlemen above named, who have professedly treated on this subject, use two sorts of arguments to prove that the Jews were deprived of the power of inflicting capital punishments by the Romans when Judæa was made a province; the one taken from the Roman laws, or nature of the Roman government, the other from certain passages of the New Testament. It is my intention first to answer these arguments, and then to offer the reasons which induce me to think that the Jews had the power of inflicting death on criminals continued to them by the Roman emperors, even after Judæa was annexed to the province of Syria.

That the arguments taken from the Roman law may be the better understood, it is necessary to premise that the judge who had the cognisance of criminal affairs was said to have *imperium merum*, and he who had the determination of civil causes, such as concerned matters of property and right, was said to have *imperium mixtum*. Jurisdiction belonged properly to each of these magistrates<sup>r</sup>: the

<sup>q</sup> Imo et judicia capitalia ab hoc senatu (i. e. LXX. in exilio Babylonico) exercita concessu regum Persarum tradunt Hebræi. In Matt. v. 22. p. 44, b. fin.

<sup>r</sup> L. 7. §. 2. l. 8. et 9. ff. de Officio Proc. l. 1. ff. de Officio

*imperium*, or power, (for *imperium* and *potestas* in this case signify one and the same thing in the civil law<sup>s</sup>; the power, I say,) that belonged to the latter was no more than was necessary to enforce his orders, or see his sentence executed<sup>t</sup>; and even that power was in some cases, at least in part, separable from jurisdiction<sup>u</sup>. Proconsuls and presidents of provinces had the whole of this power lodged with them: they had both *imperium merum* and *imperium mixtum*; had the cognisance of all criminal as well as civil affairs, and were next in power to the emperor himself, in those provinces over which they were placed<sup>x</sup>.

The first argument is taken from a law which says that the municipal magistrate cannot do those things which have more of *imperium* than of juris-

ejus cui mand. est Jurisd. Vid. Voet. in Pand. tit. de Jurisd. §. 5. Ut proinde errare videantur, qui merum imperium dictum arbitrantur tanquam separatum ab omni jurisdictione, cum nullum omnino sive in republica sive sub imperatoribus tempus fuerit, quo assertionis istius veritas obtinuit, §. 40.

<sup>s</sup> L. 215. ff. de V. S.

<sup>t</sup> L. 2. et 3. ff. de Jurisd. Vid. Voet. in Pand. tit. de Jurisd. §. 42.

<sup>u</sup> The civilians will not allow that *imperium* and *jurisdiction* are ever separated. That they are never wholly separated may be a truth: but that they are sometimes in part separated is fully evident from l. 26. ff. ad Municip. l. un. ff. Si quis jus dicenti non obtemp. l. 32. ff. de Injur. Vid. Voet. in Pand. tit. de Jurisd. §. 43, 44. However, if they will not admit of the word *separated*, the phrases *magis imperii* and *magis jurisdictionis* (which, in my mind, signify a partial separation) will serve the purpose as well.

<sup>x</sup> L. 3. ff. de Jurisd. l. 1. pr. et §. 4. ff. de Off. Præf. Urbi, l. 7. §. 2. et l. 8. et 9. ff. de Off. Proc. l. 10, 11, 12. de Off. Præsidis.

diction<sup>y</sup>. This is one instance wherein *imperium*, or power, was in great part separated from jurisdiction: for the municipal magistrates had not the power of compelling persons by punishments to obey their orders<sup>z</sup>. These magistrates had so very little power over their subjects, that they are described in the law as being without power<sup>a</sup>. It was permitted them, indeed, to chastise slaves, so they did it moderately; but this was the utmost length they were allowed to go<sup>b</sup>: and this was no more than was allowed to the master of the slave<sup>c</sup>, and seems at least to have been connived at in any other person<sup>d</sup>. That there may be any consequence in the reasoning founded upon this law, two things must be taken for granted: first, that this was part of the Roman law when Judæa was made a province; and, secondly, that the municipal and provincial magistrates were equally obliged by this law. I have seen nothing offered to clear up these two points,

<sup>y</sup> Huber. Diss. 1. l. 1. p. 11. Ea quæ magis imperii sunt quam jurisdictionis, facere non possunt magistratus municipales. L. 26. ff. ad Municip. Vid. not. Gothofr. ad locum.

<sup>z</sup> Omnibus magistratibus, non tamen duumviris, secundum jus potestatis suæ concessum est jurisdictionem suam defendere pœnali judicio. L. un. ff. Si quis jus dicenti non obtemp.

<sup>a</sup> Si ex minoribus magistratibus erit, id est, qui sine imperio aut potestate sunt magistratus. L. 32. ff. de Injuriis. Vid. not. Goth. ad locum.

<sup>b</sup> Magistratibus municipalibus supplicium a servo sumere non licet; modica autem castigatio eis non est deneganda. L. 12. ff. de Jurisd. Vid. et l. 17. §. 1. ff. Qui et a quibus manum. L. 15. §. 39. ff. de Injuriis.

<sup>c</sup> L. un. C. de emend. serv.

<sup>d</sup> Si quis corrigendi animo, aut si quis emendandi servum (alienum verberaverit) non tenetur. L. 15. §. 38. ff. de Injuriis.

which certainly ought to be fully proved before this argument can have any weight.

I very much doubt whether there was any such law as this in being at the time we are speaking of<sup>e</sup>: and I believe every one who considers what is said of the Roman municipia, by Aulus Gellius and Festus, will be of my mind. Festus informs us that there were three sorts of municipia, which differed not a little the one from the other. Some of them had not the freedom of the city of Rome, so far as to vote for or be chosen magistrates of that city: others had, and were also governed by the Roman laws. Others, who had the same right, were wholly governed by their own laws, and had a republic of their own distinct from that of the Roman people<sup>f</sup>. It is very plain, I think, that this was not the case at the time the law we are speaking of was made; for that law includes all municipal magistrates without any distinction. Aulus Gellius not only tells us that the municipia were governed by their own laws, but adds further, that they were obliged by no law of the Roman people, unless it were adopted by their own voluntary consent<sup>g</sup>. And Alexander ab Alexandro, representing the sense of the ancient authors upon this head, says that the municipia fol-

<sup>e</sup> Voet seems to express the same doubt when he says the municipal magistrates are said to be without power, l. 32. ff. de Injuriis, non alia, ut opinor, de causa, quam quia Ulpiani et Pauli tempore ipsis denegabantur ea quæ magis imperii sunt quam jurisdictionis. In Pand. tit. de Jurisdiction. §. 43. p. 104, b.

<sup>f</sup> In voc. *municipium* et *municeps*. Vid. etiam Spanhem. Orbis Rom. Exerc. 1. cap. 13. p. 99, &c.

<sup>g</sup> Neque ulla populi Romani lege adstricti, ni populus eorum fundus factus est. Noct. Att. l. 16. cap. 13. For the meaning of this phrase consult Cic. pro Balbo, et Spanh. Orb. Rom. p. 97, 98.

lowed their own customs and laws *sine imperio populi Romani*<sup>h</sup>. They had a power, therefore, of their own to enforce their laws, and had no need to apply to the Roman magistrate to assist them herein. And indeed, had it not been so, how could it be said with any tolerable propriety, as it is by Festus, that they had republics separate or distinct from the Roman people<sup>i</sup>? Livy tells us of several people conquered by the Romans that chose rather to be governed by their own laws than to have the freedom of the city of Rome<sup>k</sup>. And Aulus Gellius relates from Adrian, that the inhabitants of Præneste besought the emperor Tiberius with great earnestness that of a colony they might be made a municipium, and obtained it<sup>l</sup>. The reason was, that they might be governed by their own laws, whereas, while a colony, they were under the Roman laws. Is it possible to imagine that a people should be so very desirous of being governed by their own laws, if at the same time their magistrates had not the power of putting those laws in execution? Of what advantage could their laws be to them, if they were not able to enforce the observation of them by proper punishments? It is evident to me, therefore, that the law we are speaking of was made after the reign of Tiberius. The same thing appears also from the admiration expressed by the emperor Adrian that

<sup>h</sup> Genial. Dies, l. 4. c. 10. p. 974.

<sup>i</sup> At Serfilius aiebat initio fuisse, qui ea conditione cives Romani fuissent, ut semper rempublicam separatim a populo Romano haberent. In voc. *municeps*. Vid. etiam Spanh. Or. R. Ex. 1. cap. 13. p. 105.

<sup>k</sup> L. 9. c. 43. 45.

<sup>l</sup> Maximo opere a Tiberio imperatore petisse orâsseque ut ex colonia in municipii statum redigerentur. L. 16. c. 13.



any ancient municipia, more particularly Italica and Utica, when they might use their own customs and laws, should gladly be made colonies<sup>m</sup>. Most certainly it could be no manner of wonder that the municipia should be greatly pleased with such a change, if their own laws were but a dead letter, and their magistrates had not the power to see them put in execution. Italica and Utica were municipia during the reign of Tiberius, as is evident from his coin yet extant<sup>n</sup>. We may therefore firmly conclude that this law had no being in his time. It is not improbable it was the invention of some succeeding emperor, who was for spreading the observation of the Roman laws every where through his dominions, at least among those who had the freedom of the city of Rome. In order to make those cities of Romans which had the privilege of living according to their own laws weary of that government, and the more easy and ready to receive the Roman laws, he by this law deprived their magistrates of the power of enforcing their decrees and putting their laws in execution. This, it is likely, had in a great measure attained the end designed by the time Aulus Gellius flourished, which was, I think, in the reign of Antoninus Pius; for he says, that the colonies, though less free, had the preference given them of the municipia because of the majesty of the Roman people, of which those colo-

<sup>m</sup> Mirarique se ostendit, quod et ipsi Italicensēs, et quædam item alia municipia antiqua, in quibus Uticensēs nominat, *cum suis moribus legibusque uti possent*, in jus coloniarum mutare gesserint. L. 16. c. 13.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Cellarium, N. O. A. v. 1. p. 53. et v. 2. Afr. p. 102. et Spanh. Orb. Rom. Ex. 1. c. 16. p. 130, 131.



nies were, as it were, small images and representations; and also because the laws of the municipia were obscure and obliterated, and not capable of being used through the want of knowing them°. The municipia lying under the disadvantage of such a law as this, it seems their laws, as it is natural to suppose they would soon, fell into disuse for want of a power to enforce them, and through neglect and disuse were obliterated; i. e. the knowledge of them was wholly lost, and the Roman law obtained in their stead; insomuch that Gellius complains that the difference between the colonies and municipia was unknown in his time, and had occasioned no small confusion in their language<sup>p</sup>. But that which gave the finishing stroke to this work, and brought the provinces, as well as municipia, into the same state with the colonies, was the law of Antoninus Caracalla, which gave the freedom of the city of Rome to all the freeborn subjects of the Roman empire<sup>q</sup>. From this time all cities subject to Rome

° *Coloniæ alia necessitudo est—jura institutaque omnia populi Romani non sui arbitrii habent; quæ tamen conditio quum sit magis obnoxia et minus libera, potior tamen et præstabilior existimatur propter amplitudinem majestatemque populi Romani, cujus istæ coloniæ quasi effigies parvæ simulacraque esse quædam videntur; et simul quia obscura obliteratedque sunt municipiorum jura, quibus uti jam per innotitiam non queunt.* L. 16. c. 13.

<sup>p</sup> Quotus enim fere nostrum est, qui quum ex colonia ex populo Romano sit, non et se municipem esse, et populares suos municipes esse dicat?—Sic adeo et municipia quid et quo jure sint, quantumque a colonia differant, ignoramus. Ibid. pr.

<sup>q</sup> In orbe Romano qui sunt, ex constitutione imperatoris Antonini cives Romani effecti sunt. L. 17. ff. de Statu Hom. Nov. 78, pr. et cap. 1. Dio tells us that Mæcenæ advised Augustus to do this, l. 51. p. 370. But Suetonius says that Augustus was very

were called municipia<sup>r</sup>, which, as it has occasioned a confusion in the expression, has added to the difficulty of understanding some parts of the civil law<sup>s</sup>.

Having given the reasons why I cannot prevail with myself to think that the law we are speaking of had a being at the time Judæa was made a province, I further proceed to shew, that although it were never so clear that this law is as ancient as the argument supposes it, yet the other thing here taken for granted is by no means supportable; and that is, that the municipes and provincials were, at the time we are speaking of, upon the same footing, and equally obliged by this law. That they were so after the freedom of the city of Rome was communicated to all the members of the Roman empire by Antoninus Caracalla, is easily granted: but to assert that they were so two hundred years before this, is to contradict all that has been said upon this subject by ancient writers, and to confound things which are most distinct. The municipes were Roman citizens, the provincials were not. Supposing therefore that this law had a being at the time we have mentioned, which I am persuaded it had not, is there no reason to be assigned why it should be confined to the municipes, why not extended to the

sparing in granting to any the freedom of the city, and set his heart much upon keeping the Roman people pure from corrupt and servile mixtures, in Aug. c. 40. And Dionys. Hal. says, he gave it in his last commands to Tiberius not to confer the freedom of the city on many, l. 56. p. 541.

<sup>r</sup> Nunc abusive municipes dicimus suæ cujusque civitatis cives; ut puta Campanos, Puteolanos. L. 1. §. 1. ff. ad municipalem. Vid. Schulting. Jurisprud. vet. p. 402. n. 12, b.

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Spanheim. Orb. Rom. Ex. 1. cap. 13. p. 106, 107. et Ex. 2. c. ult. p. 575, 576.

provincials? Might not the senate and people of Rome, or the emperor Augustus, judge it beneath the dignity of Roman citizens to be tried and punished by any but magistrates of the first rank? or to have even the municipal laws of Roman citizens enforced by persons of a lower degree than those who enforced the Roman laws? Might they not also be desirous that all such who were made partakers of the Roman citizenship should be governed by the Roman laws, and hope by this method the more easily to bring them to it? But as the provincials did not stand in the same relation to them, it is natural to suppose they might not have the same concern for them, and therefore might leave them more under the power of their own magistrates.

## SECT. II.

*An answer to the second and third arguments, taken from the civil law.*

ANOTHER argument taken from the Roman law is, that *merum imperium* (or the power of judging and punishing criminals) belonged to no magistrate, unless it were given him by some special law or constitution<sup>t</sup>; insomuch that this power could by no means be transferred to those magistrates who had a delegated jurisdiction. Now if this power was not lodged in the Roman magistrates themselves, without an express law, it is not reasonable to judge that the Jews should have it, forasmuch as it is nowhere mentioned that such a law was made in their favour<sup>u</sup>.

<sup>t</sup> L. 1. ff. de Offic. ejus cui mandata est Jurisd.

<sup>u</sup> Huber. Diss. l. 1. p. 11, 12.

I readily acknowledge that the cognisance of criminal causes belonged to none among the Romans unless granted them by some special law, or by the constitution of the prince. And I hope to make it fully appear, when I come to lay down the reasons why I believe the Jews did retain among them the power of trying and executing in capital causes, that it is highly probable at least that this power was granted them by the express constitution of the Roman emperors.

A third argument taken from the civil law is, that *merum imperium* (or the power of sitting in judgment on and executing criminals) was with the presidents alone in those provinces over which they were placed<sup>x</sup>.

That the cognisance of criminal as well as civil causes was with the president of every province I have already acknowledged; but to assert that it was with him alone, is taking the thing in dispute for granted. I am very sure the laws referred to<sup>y</sup> say no such thing; and if they did, what would be the consequence? This argument would prove far more than the persons who make use of it intend. They acknowledge that the power of inflicting lesser punishments, such as scourging and the like, was lodged in Jewish magistrates<sup>z</sup>: but how could this be, if the cognisance of all criminal causes was solely in the president? *Merum imperium* includes the hearing and determining all sorts of crimes, and inflicting lesser as well as greater punishments<sup>a</sup>, and

<sup>x</sup> Huber. *ibid.* p. 13.      <sup>y</sup> L. 6. §. 8. ff. de Offic. Præsidis; l. 4. ff. eodem; l. 3. V. 13. ff. eod.      <sup>z</sup> Huber. *Diss.* l. 1. p. 13, 35-38. Lardner's *Cred.* vol. i. p. 65, 66. 151.      <sup>a</sup> L. 3. ff. de Jurisd. l. 1. pr. §. 1-4, 13. ff. de Offic. Præf. Urbi, l. 7.

particularly that of scourging<sup>b</sup>. But not the least part of this power could be delegated<sup>c</sup>. How then came the Jewish magistrates by this power? it must be by some special law. If by the constitution of the prince, where is it mentioned that any such law was made in their favour? If we have no account of any law whereby power was given them to execute these lesser punishments, why may it not as well be supposed that the power granted them was to put their own laws in execution? which, I think, I shall make appear was the real state of the case. This argument therefore, if it proves any thing, proves too much. If it be a proof that the Jews were deprived of the power of inflicting death on criminals because the presidents were sent into the province with this power, and could delegate it to no other, the same reason must also prove that they were deprived of the exercise of all punishments whatsoever upon criminals, even that of scourging. For nothing is more certain than that the presidents were invested with the power of punishing every crime, small as well as great, and that they could impart no share of this power to any other. Although, therefore, the Jewish magistrates should have been possessed of all civil jurisdiction in as full an extent as was delegated to the *legatus proconsulis*, or was lodged with the prætor at Rome, they could punish no criminal matters whatever, nor order

§. 2. l. 8. et 9. ff. de Off. Proc. l. 10, 11, 12 ff. de Off. Præs. l. 6.

§. 2. l. 7. et 8. pr. ff. de Pœnis.

<sup>b</sup> L. 7. ff. de Pœnis.

<sup>c</sup> Merum imperium, quod lege datur, non posse transire. L. 1. §. 1. ff. de Off. ejus cui mandat. est Jurisd. Nec enim potest quis gladii potestatem sibi datam, *vel cujus alterius coercitionis ad alium transferre*. L. 6. pr. ff. de Off. Proc. l. 70. ff. de Reg. Juris.

a person a whipping upon any occasion, unless a slave, or an infamous and needy wretch, in the particular case where an action lay for an injury<sup>d</sup>. But if there be any truth in the first argument we have considered, the Jewish magistrates had not even *imperium mixtum*, or the power of judging civil affairs, in its full extent. For there it is supposed they were in the same condition with the municipal magistrates, who had not that *imperium* which is usually joined with jurisdiction<sup>e</sup>; that moderate coercion, without which there is no effectual jurisdiction<sup>f</sup>; and so could not compel persons by punishments to comply with their decrees<sup>g</sup>. It is true, the municipal magistrate had the power of correcting a slave moderately<sup>h</sup>; but how it can be from hence proved that the Jewish magistrates had the power of scourging those who were free is very difficult to be seen. I have already shewn that the municipia and provinces were so unlike, so distinct, that there is no arguing from the one to the other: but had they been never so near akin, nay, were we sure that the same laws reached both, the utmost power that was granted to the municipal magistrate was to correct a slave, and that only in a moderate degree. Now if the same law obliged the Jews, it is most certain they could exercise the

<sup>d</sup> Vid. §. 10, 11. Instit. de Susp. Tutor. l. 17. §. 4, 5, 6. et l. 35. ff. de Injuriis, et Fam. lib.      <sup>e</sup> L. 1. fin. ff. de Off. ejus cui mand. est Jurisd.      <sup>f</sup> L. 5. §. 1. ff. eod.

<sup>g</sup> L. un. pr. ff. Si quis jus dicenti non obtemp. l. 26. ff. ad municip. l. 32. ff. de Injuriis. How far the municipal magistrates were enabled to support their jurisdiction may be seen in Voet. in Pand. tit. de Jurisd. §. 43. et Vinnius de Jurisd. c. 7.

<sup>h</sup> L. 12. ff. de Jurisd.



scourge upon none but slaves. This therefore demonstrates the very contrary to that which it is brought to prove. But, adds the author of this argument, the punishment of scourging was, by the custom of the Jews, inflicted on freemen, and was esteemed a moderate punishment, designed for the amendment of the transgressor. Therefore, without all doubt, this power of chastising persons of their own nation with scourges and clubs was left to them<sup>i</sup>; that is, in other words, without all doubt the Jews were governed by their own laws, and not by the Roman law. Thus is this gentleman insensibly led, by his own way of reasoning, to give up his cause.

I am fully persuaded that the law referred to, i. e. l. 12. *ff. de Jurisd.* was not extant at the time Judæa was made a province. It is well known, that at that time the life of a slave was had in small account among the Romans; so that every master might kill his slave as he pleased, with impunity<sup>k</sup>; and slaves were put upon a level with cattle<sup>l</sup>. The *præfectus vigilum*, an officer appointed by Augustus to command the night-guard, had not the power to inflict death on a freeman<sup>m</sup>; yet we read that he

<sup>i</sup> Huber. Dissert. l. 1. p. 38.

<sup>k</sup> §. 1. Instit. de his qui sui vel alieni juris, l. 1. §. 1. ff. eod. Seneca de Benefic. l. 3. c. 23. Nec indignata est ab his se vitam accepisse, in quos vitæ necisque potestatem habuisset. Vid. de Clementia, l. 1. c. 18. Ter. And. act. 1. scen. 2. Plaut. Asinar. act. 3. scen. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Ut igitur apparet, servis exæquat quadrupedes, quæ pecudum numero sunt. L. 2. §. 2. ff. ad Leg. Aquil. l. 38. §. 2, 3. ff. ad Ædilit. Edict.

<sup>m</sup> L. 1, 2, 3. ff. de Off. Præf. Vigil. et Voet. Com. cod.

put a slave to death<sup>n</sup>. By the Petronian law, which was made in the time of the emperor Nero<sup>o</sup>, masters were forbid to deliver up their servants to fight with the beasts, unless the cause was first heard, and the servant condemned thereto by the judge<sup>p</sup>. Adrian is the first emperor we read of in the Roman law<sup>q</sup> who was touched with humanity towards servants. He banished Umbricia, a Roman matron, for five years, because she treated her maids most cruelly for the slightest faults<sup>r</sup>. And Spartian says he forbid that slaves should be killed by their masters, and commanded that they should be condemned by the judges, if they had done any thing worthy of death<sup>s</sup>. Afterwards Antoninus Pius subjected those who killed their slaves to the penalties of the law against murder<sup>t</sup>; and if, upon complaint, it was at any time found that servants were inhumanly and barbarously dealt by, ordered that they should be sold to other masters<sup>u</sup>. From the consideration of these several facts, I think it is not at all likely that

<sup>n</sup> L. 15. ff. de condictione causa data, &c.

<sup>o</sup> Anno urb. cond. 813. anno Christi 61. Vid. Gothof. in loc.

<sup>p</sup> L. 11. ff. ad Leg. Cornel. de Sicariis.

<sup>q</sup> We read, indeed, in Suetonius, that the emperor Claudius decreed, that those servants who were exposed on the island of Æsculapius for cure (for it seems many sick servants were sent thither by their masters, with an intention to take no further care of them) should be free; and if they recovered, should not return into the dominion of their masters. And if any master chose rather to kill his servant than expose him, he should be deemed guilty of murder. In Vit. Claud. c. 25. n. 5. p. 686.

<sup>r</sup> L. 2. fin. ff. de his qui alieni vel sui Juris.

<sup>s</sup> Servos a dominis occidi vetuit, eosque jussit damnari per judices, si digni essent. Vid. Schulting. Jurisprud. Vet. p. 29. n. 8.

<sup>t</sup> §. 2. Instit. de his qui alien. vel sui Juris, l. 1. §. 2. ff. eod.

<sup>u</sup> L. 2. ff. eod.

a law, which is so gentle towards slaves as not to permit any more than a moderate correction of them by the municipal magistrates, should be of so high a date as the reign of Augustus. Most probably it was made in or after the time of Adrian.

### SECT. III.

*An answer to the principal argument taken from the New Testament.*

I PROCEED now to the second sort of arguments used to prove that the Jews were deprived of the power of inflicting death on criminals; and they are taken from certain passages of the New Testament. The first, and most plausible of all, is that saying of the Jews to Pilate, *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death*<sup>x</sup>. This is represented as an ample acknowledgment of the Jews themselves, that they had not at this time the power of inflicting death on criminals<sup>y</sup>.

Should I to this oppose the saying of Tertullus the orator concerning Paul, *Whom we took, and would have judged according to our law. But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him out of our hands*<sup>z</sup>; or should I reply to it in the same manner as some have done to this saying of Tertullus, “It is not easy to say “what we are to understand by these words<sup>a</sup>—— “Indeed I think there is but little regard to be had “to what Tertullus says<sup>b</sup>,” though at the same time it is very observable that the high priest and

<sup>x</sup> John xviii. 31.

<sup>y</sup> Huber. Dissert. l. 1. c. 3. p. 14, 15.

Lardner's Credib. vol. 1. c. 2. p. 83.

<sup>z</sup> Acts xxiv. 6, 7.

<sup>a</sup> Lardner's Cred. vol. 1. p. 129.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. p. 131. Vid. Huber.

Diss. l. 1. c. 5. p. 24, 25.

elders of the Jewish nation assented to the truth of what Tertullus said, and affirmed that things were as he had represented them<sup>c</sup>; or should I express myself as a learned gentleman has done concerning those words of the Jews to our Saviour, *We never were in bondage to any man*<sup>d</sup>, “There is no relying “upon the words of such men as these<sup>e</sup>,” I think these gentlemen could have nothing to object. If the Jews are inconsistent with themselves, or not the strictest adherers to truth in their assertions, have not I the same liberty to suppose them guilty of varying from the truth in the saying now before us, as others have in such sayings of theirs as they apprehend contradictory to this?

However, there is not the least occasion for such answers as these. It sufficiently appears from the context itself, that the meaning of this saying of the Jews could not be that they were by the Romans deprived of the liberty of judging men by their law, and putting them to death. It is remarkable, that as Pilate says to the Jews in the words immediately before, *Take ye him, and judge him according to your law*; so the evangelist adds, in the words immediately following, *that the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying what death he should die*. Our blessed Lord had not only prophesied that he should die a violent death<sup>f</sup>, but had named the manner of his death, which was crucifixion; and that, in order hereunto, he should be betrayed into the hands of the chief priests and Scribes, who should pronounce him wor-

<sup>c</sup> Acts xxiv. 1—9.<sup>d</sup> John viii. 33.<sup>e</sup> Lard. Cred. vol. 1.

p. 93.

<sup>f</sup> Matt. xvii. 22, 23. Mark ix. 31.

thy of death, and then deliver him to the Gentiles<sup>g</sup>. The evangelist John expressly observes, that by the phrase of his being *lifted up*, *our Lord signified what death he should die*<sup>h</sup>. He in this place remarks the fulfilment hereof, and rests it upon the Jews refusing to judge and punish our Saviour according to their law, as Pilate directed them. Pilate said, *Take ye him, and judge him according to your law*. This offer the Jews reject, in saying, *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death*. Then the evangelist remarks, *That the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying what death he should die*. It so fell out, through the overruling providence of God, that the Jews thought proper to refuse the trial of our Saviour, and persisted herein, although Pilate expressly referred it to them; and this was the true occasion of the fulfilment of our Lord's prophecy. For had he been judicially tried and condemned by the Jews, he had not been *crucified*. The law of Moses knew no such punishment. He might have been stoned, or strangled, or burnt, or put to death by the sword<sup>i</sup>, according as the crime was for which he was condemned; but he could not have been *crucified*.

Taking these words, therefore, as they stand connected with the context, they are so far from proving that the Romans had deprived the Jews of the power of inflicting death on criminals, that they shew the contrary, and plainly imply, that it was in

<sup>g</sup> Matt. xx. 18, 19. *The Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the Scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles, to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him*. Ch. xxvi. 2. Luke xxiv. 6, 7.

<sup>h</sup> John xii. 32, 33.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Mishna Sanhed. c. 7.



their option whether they would try Jesus themselves, or deliver him to be tried by the governor. For their answer is most evidently a refusal of the governor's offer, referring Jesus to be tried by themselves; and by this refusal of theirs came to pass the fulfilment of our Saviour's prophecy. If we interpret the words in any other way, we destroy the connection, and make little or no sense of what goes before, or else of what follows after. Would Pilate say to the Jews, *Take ye him, and judge him according to your law*, if they had not the power to inflict the penalty their law prescribed? This would be mere mockery. And indeed so it is understood by some<sup>k</sup>; as though Pilate in these words, by a severe sarcasm, put the Jews in mind of the power they had lost. But how then will the latter sentence cohere, *that the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled*, &c.?

Let us take it for granted that Pilate makes himself merry with the impotence of the Jewish nation when he bids them *take Jesus, and judge him according to their law*. The answer of the Jews then, we must suppose, is a serious reply hereto: "Why do you taunt us with our want of power?" "You well know that you Romans have by force" "deprived us of our judicatories in all capital causes," "and made it unlawful for us to put any man to" "death." In this case how will follow what is added by the evangelist, *that the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, signifying what death he should die*? Does the fulfilment depend upon this answer of the Jews? Not in the least. Do they hereby re-

<sup>k</sup> Scaliger. Vid. Huber. Dissert. l. 1. c. 3. p. 15.



fuse any thing which it was in their power not to have refused? No. Do they hereby voluntarily give up Jesus into the hands of the Gentiles to be judged by them, when they might have judged him themselves? On the contrary, they declare that it was not in their power to inflict death on him or on any man; and therefore that they were constrained and forced to deliver him to the Gentiles, in order to his being judged and punished. The fulfilment of the prophecy, therefore, does not at all depend upon the reply made by the Jews to Pilate, but upon the hard condition the Romans had laid upon them in taking from them the use of their own laws. The evangelist John plainly rests the fulfilment of the prophecy upon the answer which the Jews make to Pilate; but this interpretation rests it upon a circumstance as well known before the answer was made as after. So that in truth it bears no manner of relation to the answer, nor has any connection with it.

Let us, however, proceed one step further, and take it for granted that the apostle does not mean that the fulfilment of the prophecy had any relation to the answer made by the Jews, but only to the well-known circumstance of that time, referred to or signified by this answer, viz. that the Romans had deprived the Jews of the power of inflicting death upon criminals. What will be the consequence? In truth, that the prediction, which relates the manner of our Lord's death, was no prophecy. For if it was the stated course of things at that time that the Jews could put no man to death, but were obliged to deliver up every one, whom they esteemed a malefactor deserving of death, to the Roman governor, to be punished by him, wherein lay the diffi-

culty of foreseeing this? It must be observed, that we are speaking now of the prophecy only, so far as it related the manner of our Lord's death. For it is the fulfilment of this in particular that the apostle John remarks. After our Lord had foretold that he should be delivered into the hands of the chief priests and Scribes, and they should condemn him to death<sup>l</sup>, if it was the known fixed method for them to deliver up malefactors to the governor, and it was the constant practice of the Romans to crucify all criminals of a low and mean condition, as it is acknowledged to have been<sup>m</sup>, what could there be remarkable in the manner of his death? Was it any other than such, which those who were of the condition he was pleased to appear in, when taken and condemned by the Jewish rulers, had reason to expect?

What then is the meaning of the Jews, when they say, *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death?* I have already shewn from the context that these words contain a refusal of the offer made them by Pilate, that they should take and judge Jesus according to their own law. Something more therefore must be understood than what is expressed; and nothing, I think, can so reasonably be supplied to make the sense full, as that which regards the time when the words were spoken, being the first day of the passover week, and the preparation for the sabbath: *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death this holy festival*<sup>n</sup>. This is the con-

<sup>l</sup> Mark x. 33.

<sup>m</sup> Huber. Dissert. l. 1. c. 3. §. 3. p. 16.

<sup>n</sup> Σάββατόν ἐστιν, οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι ἄραι τὸν κράββατον. Joan. v. 10. I would ask any, whether, if the first words, Σάββατόν ἐστι, were left out, they could possibly misunderstand the place, and whether these words might not most easily be understood from the con-

struction put on the words by St. Augustine<sup>o</sup>, Cyril<sup>p</sup>, and others of the ancients<sup>q</sup>. And this agrees exactly with the rule laid down in the Talmud. The Mishna says expressly that capital causes, in which the criminal was condemned, were always to

text. The words *πάσχα ἐστὶ*, or *ἐορτή ἐστι*, are here left out, but are most easily supplied from the context; for in the eighteenth verse it is said that they themselves entered not into the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover. Pilate, who had been now some years governor, could not but be acquainted with their customs, and no doubt understood them as fully as if they had said, *Σάββατόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστι ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα*. The first day of the passover week is called a sabbath, Lev. xxiii. 11. (Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 1. p. 222. and vol. 2. p. 184.) When they were forbid to do any servile work on this day, was it lawful for them to execute a criminal? or would they, who esteemed it a breach of the sabbath to heal a person on that day, allow the taking away of life on it? If there be any truth in the rule laid down by the Jewish doctors, that those who accused or were witnesses against a man for any capital crime were obliged first to warn him that what he was committing laid him open to the punishment of death, (vid. Selden. de Syned. l. 2. c. 13. §. 2.) possibly this might be the reason why the Jews added those words, *Σάββατόν ἐστι*, when they spake to the man who carried his bed, as being a necessary part of the form of premonition required to his conviction. But when the Jews spake to Pilate there was no need of their being thus explicit. It is observable that Herod kept Peter in prison till the passover was past, Acts xii. 4. And that it was esteemed an honour due to great festivals to omit the punishment of criminals on such days is evident from Philo in Flac. p. 976-7. Ἐὼ λέγειν, ὅτι εἰ καὶ μυρία ἦσαν ἡμαρτηκότες, ὥφειλε τὸν καιρὸν αἰδεσθεῖς τὰς τιμωρίας ὑπερθέσθαι, &c. "If they had been never so guilty, he ought in reverence " to the season to have delayed their punishment." Doubtless it was in honour of the passover that the Roman governor was wont to release unto the Jews a prisoner, whomsoever they desired.

<sup>o</sup> Tractat. 114. in Joan.

<sup>p</sup> L. 12. in Joan. c. vi.

<sup>q</sup> Chrysost. Hom. 82. in Joan. Beda in cap. xviii. Joan.

be finished on the day after the trial began: for which reason these trials were never to begin the day before the sabbath, or the day before a festival<sup>r</sup>. The gloss says, for otherwise the decision of the judgment would be on the sabbath; but it is not lawful to prolong the day of one that is condemned to die, (i. e. it is not lawful to defer his execution to another day,) nor can capital punishments be inflicted on him the same day, because of the sabbath<sup>s</sup>: and Maimonides says, if a person was accused of a capital crime on the day before the sabbath, they kept him in custody to the first day of the week, and then tried him<sup>t</sup>.

In answer to this, it is said, that some malefactors were reserved to the time of their great feasts, that the execution might be the more public<sup>u</sup>: and it is true the Mishna does say, that the stubborn elder, who refused to obey the decrees of the great sanhedrim, was to be kept in custody till one of the three great feasts, and during the feast to be put to death, that all the people might hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously<sup>x</sup>. I might possibly have said that this was a singular case, and an exception to a general rule, were it not that the Jewish masters from a parity of reason conclude the same thing of three other cases, which are those of the rebellious son, the enticer to idolatry, and the false witness. And these are the only malefactors, mentioned by Jewish writers, who were to be reserved to one

<sup>r</sup> In Sanhed. c. 4. §. 1. fin.

<sup>s</sup> Cocceii duo tituli Talmud,

p. 31.

<sup>t</sup> Halac Sanhed. c. 11. Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 2.

c. 10. §. 2. p. 1433, &c. 13. §. 1. p. 1496. <sup>u</sup> Huber. Dissert.

l. 1. c. 3. §. 2. p. 15. pr.

<sup>x</sup> In Sanhed. c. 10. §. 4. Vid.

Lightfoot, vol. 1. p. 968. fin.

of the three great feasts to be then punished<sup>y</sup>. However, it seems not probable to me that even these criminals were to be executed on the principal feast-days, which were well nigh as strictly observed as their sabbaths; but on Moedkaton<sup>z</sup>, some lesser holidays, such as in their festival weeks came between the first and the last days of the solemnity<sup>a</sup>. For the first and the last days were by divine appointment to be kept like their sabbaths, and no servile work was to be done therein<sup>b</sup>. But be that as it will, it is certain our Saviour was not accused of any of those four crimes.

The day on which our Lord was put to death was the first day of the passover week, and the fifteenth day of the month. It was unlawful therefore for them to try him on the fourteenth, or to put him to death on the fifteenth, and the next day was the sabbath. So that they must have reserved him in custody to the seventeenth, which was the first day of the week, before they could have tried him, and to the eighteenth before they could have executed him, had they proceeded according to their own rules. But such delays no doubt they esteemed dangerous, and therefore pushed for his immediate execution in another way. What we read of their hearing witnesses, and pronouncing him guilty<sup>c</sup>, I

<sup>y</sup> Selden. de Syned. l. 3. c. 3. §. 7, 8. p. 1636-7.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 1. p. 968, 969. the word חג made use of here by the Mishna signifies the whole time of the solemnity, and so does the word ἑορτή both in the Gospels and in Josephus. Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxvi. 5. and xxvii. 15.

<sup>a</sup> In this particular Grotius concurs with me, in Matt. xxvi. 5. p. 242. b. 25. ad fin. usque.

<sup>b</sup> Lev. xxiii. 7, 8, 35, 36.

<sup>c</sup> Matt. xxvi. 59, 60, 61. 66.



take to have been extra-judicial. It was not done with a view to put him to death by their own laws, and therefore they wholly neglected the rules usually observed by them in all capital causes. Had they followed those rules, they must not have sat at the high priest's house<sup>d</sup>, but in the temple, in the room Gazith<sup>e</sup>: nor must they have heard his cause by night<sup>f</sup>: nor must they have tried him on the day before so great a festival. But, designing this as a mere extra-judicial affair, they had no regard to rules; and having determined to take away his life as soon as possible, they would not keep him in custody to the first day of the week, when they might have sat in judgment on him; but were fully bent upon delivering him up to the Roman governor, and trying their interest with him to have him immediately executed. The manifest reason of this was their fear of the people, lest they should arise, and attempt a rescue<sup>g</sup>. For this reason they had once resolved not to apprehend him at the feast<sup>h</sup>; but having so fair an opportunity put into their hands by Judas, they departed from that resolution. However, the same reason prevailed with them to push on his execution with all possible speed; and to this end, I am persuaded, they placed their own creatures and dependants in great numbers near the prætorium, who were instant with loud voices, requiring that he might be crucified<sup>i</sup>.

It is pretended that it was the duty of the muni-

<sup>d</sup> Matt. xxvi. 57. John xviii. 24.      <sup>e</sup> Seld. de Syned. l. 2.

c. 15. §. 10. p. 1558.      <sup>f</sup> Mishna Sanhed. c. 4. §. 1. prop. fin.

Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 10. §. 2. p. 1423.      <sup>g</sup> Luke xxii. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Matt. xxvi. 5. Mark xiv. 2.      <sup>i</sup> Matt. xxvii. 20. Mark xv. 11.



cipal magistrates to apprehend and imprison malefactors, to give them a hearing, and take cognisance of their crimes, to examine witnesses, and other legal proofs; and if they found them guilty, to condemn them as worthy of punishment, with this view, that they should send them to the president of the province loaded with this previous judgment and condemnation of theirs: and although the president was obliged to hear the whole cause over again, yet it is supposed he paid a favourable regard to the representation of these magistrates, and generally concurred with them in his sentence. Now because it is said in the Gospels that our Saviour was first examined and condemned in the Jewish council, then delivered by them to the Roman governor, who again tried and condemned him, it is taken for granted that this is a case parallel with the former, and founded upon the same part of the Roman law<sup>k</sup>. But the whole of this is without any foundation. What is said of the municipal magistrates is not proved by the law alleged<sup>l</sup>: and if it were, how does it thence follow that in our Saviour's time the magistrates of provinces were bound to do the same with them? Why is it not first shewn that the municipia and provinces were in those early days governed by the same laws? This I take to be beyond the power of man. Notwithstanding, in the present

<sup>k</sup> Huber. Dissert. l. i. c. 4. §. 2, 3, 4. p. 19, 20, 21. Lard. Cred. vol. 1. p. 97. 144.

<sup>l</sup> L. 6. ff. de Custod. et Exhib. Reorum. This law makes not out the thing for which it is brought, unless it be first shewn that the Irenarchs there mentioned were *duumviri*, or municipal magistrates, which I am persuaded will be a difficult task.

dispute, this is always taken for a thing certain, and arguments are founded upon it<sup>m</sup>. But were we to allow this also, it will appear evident to any one, who examines the history of our Saviour's trial, that there is little similitude between the two cases.

The previous trial and condemnation before the supposed municipal magistrates were for the same crimes contained in the eulogium or accusation sent to the Roman governor, for which very crimes the malefactor was tried over again by the governor. But in our Saviour's case the crimes were quite different<sup>n</sup>. Whilst our Lord is before the Jewish council, he is accused of having said that *he would destroy the temple, and build it again in three days*<sup>o</sup>: and at length, being questioned upon oath by the high priest, is, from the answer he made, condemned for blasphemy. But not a word is said before them of his sedition or treason. On the other hand, when he is brought before Pilate, the Jewish magistrates accuse him of sedition and treason<sup>p</sup>. Indeed, when they found that Pilate cleared him of those crimes, they added, *We have a law, and by*

<sup>m</sup> Huber, through his whole Dissertation, takes it for granted that the state of the Roman government, with regard to the provinces, was the same in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius as it was after the law of Antoninus Caracalla, p. 18, 19. He quotes the poet Ausonius as describing the magistrates of municipia without the power of inflicting death. This poet lived at the latter end of the fourth century, above a hundred and fifty years after the whole Roman empire was taken into the citizenship of Rome, and there was no longer any distinction between municipia and other cities.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxvii. 11.    <sup>o</sup> Mark xiv. 58. Matt. xxvi. 61.

<sup>p</sup> Luke xxiv. 1—5. particularly, that it was unlawful to pay tribute to Cæsar.

*our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.* But this was so far from moving Pilate to condemn him, that it rather inclined him to release him<sup>q</sup>: and it is certain that what the Jews called blasphemy was esteemed no crime among the Romans, and an accusation of this kind at a Roman tribunal must have been without effect. What prevailed with Pilate at length to give him up to their importunate solicitations was that saying of theirs, *If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend*; which plainly implied a threatening that they would accuse him to Cæsar of remissness in his duty. The argument they use with Pilate is in brief this: "Though you, sir, judge not this man guilty of the sedition and treason laid to his charge, yet we know him to be deserving of death by our law; and if you will not gratify our desire in punishing him with death, we shall accuse you to Tiberius Cæsar as greatly negligent in suppressing sedition:" and it is well known that Tiberius was of a suspicious, jealous nature<sup>r</sup>, and very ready to hearken to such complaints. This was an argument Pilate could not withstand; therefore yielded to their importunity, and condemned him as guilty of the sedition and treason they had accused him of<sup>s</sup>, which appeared by the title he put over his head.

#### SECT. IV.

*An answer to two other arguments taken from the New Testament.*

A SECOND argument is taken from those words of

<sup>q</sup> John xix. 7—12.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Grot. in Joan. xix. 13.

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Huber. Diss. l. 1. c. 3. §. 3. p. 16.

Pilate to our Saviour, *Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and power to release thee*<sup>t</sup>?

Which words are said clearly and expressly to declare that Pilate was the only and supreme judge, and that there was no other magistrate to whom it was granted by law to determine this capital cause, by pronouncing sentence of absolution or condemnation<sup>u</sup>.

That Pilate was supreme judge under the emperor, and under the governor of Syria, not in this case only, but in every other case which happened within the province of Judæa, I readily grant; but I cannot perceive the least intimation that he was the only judge. If the Jewish magistrates had tried our Saviour with an intention to execute him themselves, there is not the least doubt but Pilate could have sent a prohibition, stopped their proceedings, called the cause before himself, and released him. But it cannot follow from hence that they had no power to condemn and execute malefactors when the governor did not think fit to interpose. Inferior courts may certainly be said to have a power, though they are under the control of superior ones. It is well known that the Romans punished offenders in federate cities<sup>x</sup>, and that the presidents of provinces exercised authority over kings themselves<sup>y</sup>: does it hence follow that these had not *jus gladii*, the power of trying and executing criminals?

There is another passage in the New Testament which I find interpreted this way; and that is in

<sup>t</sup> John xix. 10.

<sup>u</sup> Huber, Dissert. l. 1. c. 3. §. 4. p. 16.

Vid. Lardner's Cred. vol. 1. p. 83.

<sup>x</sup> L. 7. ff. de Captiv.

<sup>y</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 19. c. 8.

the case of the woman taken in adultery. The Jews say to our Lord, *Moses in the law commanded, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?* It is added, *This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him*<sup>z</sup>: to accuse him before the Roman governor, if he determined that she ought to be stoned; because, if the Jews were prohibited the execution of their own laws in capital cases, this might be interpreted an exciting them to rebellion: and if he determined that she ought not to be stoned, to accuse him of derogating from the law of Moses, and thereby lessen his credit among the people<sup>a</sup>.

This, it must be owned, when persons are prepossessed with the notion that the Romans had deprived the Jews of the power of inflicting capital punishments, seems an interpretation natural enough. But here is not one word said upon which to ground this notion: and it is probable the only snare here laid for our Saviour was, to get from him something in derogation of the law of Moses. He had often preached the doctrine of forgiveness in the strongest terms, even in such cases wherein the law of Moses allowed the same evils to be inflicted by the judge on the injurious person as had been done to the injured<sup>b</sup>. The Pharisees might hence possibly suspect that our Lord would determine absolutely against the execution of the penalties enjoined in the law of Moses, and hope to accuse him hereof before the magistrate, as well as raise a spirit in the people against him.

<sup>z</sup> John viii. 5, 6.      <sup>a</sup> Grot. in Joan. viii. 6. Lard. Cred. vol. 1. p. 68, 69, 70.

<sup>b</sup> Matt. v. 38, &c.



## SECT. V.

*The Romans frequently indulged the nations they conquered in the use of their own laws, even in capital causes.*

I PROCEED now to give the reasons which induce me to think that the Jews had the power of inflicting death on criminals continued to them under the Roman government. First, nothing is more evident than that many cities and some whole countries had granted them by the people and emperors of Rome the privilege of being governed by their own laws and their own magistrates, some in a more ample and full, and some in a more restrained manner. Several of the cities and little nations in Italy, under the ancient republic, chose rather to be governed by their own laws than to be made citizens of Rome, and be under the Roman laws; and it was granted them, as we are informed by Livy<sup>c</sup> and Tully<sup>d</sup>. After the conquest made in the second Punic war the Romans permitted the Carthaginians to live ac-

<sup>c</sup> Hernicorum tribus populis, Alatrinati, Verulano, Terentinati, quia maluerunt, quam civitatem, suæ leges redditæ—Anagninis, quique arma Romanis intulerant, civitas sine suffragii latione data: concilia connubiaque adempta: et magistratibus, præterquam sacrorum curatione, interdictum. Lib. 9. c. 43, prop. fin. Prænestinis militibus senatus Romanus duplex stipendium et quinquennii militiæ vacationem decrevit. Civitate quum donarentur ob virtutem, non mutaverunt. L. 23. c. 20, pr. Alios in ea fortuna haberent, ut socii esse quam cives mallent. L. 26. c. 24. prop. pr.

<sup>d</sup> In quo magna contentione Heracliensium et Neapolitanorum fuit, cum magna pars in iis civitatibus fœderis sui libertatem civitati anteferet. *Pro Balbo*, c. 8. (21.) p. 597, pr.

cording to their own laws<sup>c</sup>. The islands of Sicily<sup>f</sup> and Sardinia<sup>g</sup>, when Roman provinces, used their own laws. The Grecian cities both in Europe and Asia had their liberty and laws preserved to them when the Romans vanquished Philip king of Macedonia<sup>h</sup>, which were restored again to the Phocæenses, when their city was taken by Æmilius Scaurus, in the war with Antiochus<sup>i</sup>: for they had fallen off from the Romans to that king. To the Macedonians, after the Romans had taken Perseus their king, it was granted that they should use their own laws, choosing their magistrates every year<sup>k</sup>. The

<sup>c</sup> Ut liberi legibus suis viverent; quas urbes, quosque agros, quibusque finibus ante bellum tenuissent, tenerent. *Livii*, l. 30. c. 37. Ἐθεσι καὶ νόμοις χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἰδίοις. *Polyb.* l. 15. p. 705, B. Δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς ἡ σύγκλητος τὴν τ' ἐλευθερίαν, καὶ τοὺς νόμους, ἔτι δὲ τὴν χῶραν ἅπασαν. *Excerpt. Legat.* 142. p. 973, fin.

<sup>f</sup> Siculi hoc jure sunt, ut, quod civis cum cive agat, domi certet suis legibus. *Cic. in Ver.* l. 2. c. 13, pr.

<sup>g</sup> *Diodor. Sicul.* l. 5. p. 296, a. Μέχρι τοῦ νῦν αὐτονομίαν τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις ἀσάλευτον φυλάξαι, et p. 297, pr. Διεφύλαξε τὴν ἐλευθερίαν μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων. The historian indeed tells us that neither Carthaginians nor Romans were able to take it from them; but I think it more probable that it was the voluntary grant of the latter.

<sup>h</sup> Omnes Græcorum civitates, quæ in Europa, quæque in Asia essent, libertatem ac suas leges haberent. *Livii*, l. 33. c. 32, pr. Vid. et l. 34. c. 22, prop. fin. Ἐλευθέρους ὑπάρχειν, καὶ νόμοις χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἰδίοις. *Polyb. Excerpt. Leg.* 9. p. 795.

<sup>i</sup> Urbem agrosque, et suas leges restituit. *Liv.* l. 37, 9. et 32. Phocæensibus et ager quam ante bellum habuerunt, redditus; et ut legibus antiquis uterentur, permissum. *L.* 38. c. 39. Ἀπέδωκαν δὲ καὶ Φωκαίεῦσι τὸ πάτριον πολίτευμα, καὶ τὴν χώραν ἣν καὶ πρότερον εἶχον. *Polyb. Excerpt. Legat.* 36. p. 844, fin.

<sup>k</sup> Omnium primum liberos esse placebat Macedonas atque Illyrios. *Liv.* l. 45. c. 18. et 22. Habentes urbes easdem agrosque,

Illyrians<sup>l</sup>, Galatians<sup>m</sup>, and Phrygians<sup>n</sup> had the same liberty. In Syria, Antioch<sup>o</sup>, Gaza, Joppa, Dora, Cæsarea<sup>p</sup>, Seleucia<sup>q</sup>, Tyre, and Sidon<sup>r</sup>, were free cities, with many other places. In a word, there were some provinces, the greatest part of which, if not the whole, were allowed to live according to their own laws<sup>s</sup>. And there was scarce any one province in which there were not large districts and many cities which had the same liberty. Now if it was so common a thing with the Romans to grant a conquered people the choice of their own magistrates, and the use of their own laws, why may it not be thought that this was allowed by them in Judæa? why must we suppose that they were placed in a worse condition than so great a number of other countries<sup>t</sup>? That the Carthaginians, after the second

utentes legibus suis, annuos creantes magistratus, c. 29. Τῶν δὲ δέκα πρεσβέων ἐκ Ῥώμης ἀφικομένων, Μακεδόσι μὲν ἀπέδωκε τὴν χώραν καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἐλευθέρας οἰκεῖν καὶ αὐτονόμους. Plut. in Æmil. p. 270, B.

<sup>l</sup> Liv. l. 45. c. 26. Senatum populumque Romanum Illyrios esse liberos jubere.

<sup>m</sup> Τοῖς παρὰ τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας Γαλατῶν πρεσβυταῖς συνεχώρησαν τὴν αὐτονομίαν μένουσιν ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις κατοικίαις, καὶ μὴ στρατευομένοις ἐκτὸς τῶν ἰδίων ὄρων. Polyb. Excerpt. Leg. 102.

<sup>n</sup> Φρυγίαν—αὐτόνομον μεθήκεν, scil. ἡ βουλὴ, Appian. de Bell. Mithr. p. 208, D.

<sup>o</sup> Joan. Malala Chron. l. 9. p. 278, pr.

<sup>p</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 14. c. 4. §. 4, fin.

<sup>q</sup> Strabo, l. 16. p. 751, D. Eutrop. l. 6. c. 14. p. 249.

<sup>r</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 15. c. 4. §. 1, fin. Vid. et Noris. Epoch. Syr. Mac. Diss. 5. c. 3. Spanh. Orb. Rom. p. 330—1.

<sup>s</sup> Such as Sicily, Sardinia, and some time possibly Achaia, Asia, Cyprus.

<sup>t</sup> The Jews were in hopes that an argument of this kind would prevail even with Caligula himself not to violate their laws; Ἡ περὶ τοῦ μὴ πάντων, καὶ τῶν ἐν ἐσχατιαῖς ἐθνῶν, οἷς τετῆρηται τὰ πάτρια, ἔλαττον ἐνέγκασθαι. Philo de Legat. ad Caium, p. 1026, E.

Punic war, had the power of executing their own laws, even where the punishments were capital, I believe no learned man ever yet doubted ; or that the Grecians had that power after the war with Philip. What hinders then from concluding the same with regard to all those places to which the Romans granted their own magistrates and their own laws ? when the very same phrases are used by classic writers in speaking of the one, as are made use of by them when speaking of the other, what should prevent our understanding them in the same sense ? or let it be shewn when these words began to vary their signification. I would also know if the Macedonian magistrates had not the power of inflicting corporal punishments and death upon malefactors, how it was possible to preserve the peace of that country when the Roman governor, who was among them, was without that power. Cicero, if I mistake him not, expressly says that such governors were sent thither in his time, and that the peace of the province was kept by the power it had within itself, i. e. by the vigilance of the magistrates in executing their own laws <sup>u</sup>.

Some countries seem to have been almost wholly exempted from the rods and the axes, i. e. from the power of the governor who was sent into the province. Thus, for instance, of Massilia, (now called Marseilles,) and of all the places subject to it, Strabo

<sup>u</sup> Atque hanc Macedoniam, domitis jam gentibus finitimis, barbariæque compressa, pacatam ipsam *per se*, et quietam, tenui præsidio, atque exigua manu, etiam *sine imperio*, per legatos nomine ipso populi Romani tuebamur : quæ nunc *consulari imperio*, atque exercitu ita vexata est, &c. *De Prov. Consular.* c. 3. prop. p. 589, fin.

says, that they were not obliged to obey the governors sent into the province <sup>x</sup>. He says the same thing of Nemausus, (now called Nismes,) together with the twenty-four towns under it <sup>y</sup>. Both these places were in the province of Gallia Narbonensis <sup>z</sup>. What Strabo asserts of these parts of Gaul was no doubt true also of the Lacedæmonians; of whom Tully affirms, that they had lived to his time more than seven hundred years without having changed their laws <sup>a</sup>. Polybius also says that Lycurgus, by the laws he gave them, preserved liberty to the Lacedæmonians longer than it had been secured to any other people of whom he had the knowledge <sup>b</sup>: and Apollonius calls them the freest of the Grecians <sup>c</sup>. The Rhodians I am persuaded were favoured with

<sup>x</sup> Καὶ ὁ Καῖσαρ δὲ καὶ οἱ μετ' ἐκεῖνον ἡγεμόνες, πρὸς τὰς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ γεννηθείσας ἀμαρτίας, ἐμετρίασαν, μεμνημένοι τῆς φιλίας, καὶ τὴν αὐτονομίαν ἐφύλαξαν, ἣν ἐξαρχῆς εἶχεν ἡ πόλις, ὥστε μὴ ὑπακούειν τῶν εἰς τὴν ἰπαρχίαν πεμπομένων στρατηγῶν. l. 4. p. 181, B. Vid. et Cic. pro Flacco, c. 26. (63) p. 492. Neque vero te, Massilia, prætereo,—cujus ego civitatis disciplinam atque gravitatem non solum Græciæ, sed haud scio an cunctis gentibus anteponendam jure dicam: quæ—sic optimatum consilio gubernatur, ut omnes ejus instituta laudare facilius possint, quam æmulari.

<sup>y</sup> Διὰ δὲ τοῦτο οὐδ' ὑπὸ τοῖς προστάγμασι (for so undoubtedly it ought to be read, and not πράγμασι) τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης στρατηγῶν ἐστὶ τὸ ἔθνος τοῦτο, l. 4. p. 187, A.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Strabo, l. 4. p. 178, B. et p. 189, C. Ταῦτα μὲν ὑπὲρ τῶν νεμομένων τὴν Ναρβωνίτιν ἐπικράτειαν λέγομεν.

<sup>a</sup> Lacedæmonii soli toto orbe terrarum septingentos jam annos amplius unis moribus et nunquam mutatis legibus vivunt. *Pro Flacco*, c. 26. (63. pr.) p. 492.

<sup>b</sup> L. 6. c. 1. p. 459. Vid. et Strab. l. 8. p. 376, fin. Καὶ διετέλεσαν τὴν αὐτονομίαν φυλάττοντες.

<sup>c</sup> Ἐλευθερώτατοι μὲν γὰρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἰσὶ, μόνοι δ' ὑπήκοοι τοῦ εὖ συμβουλευόντος. In Vit. Apollon. l. 6. c. 10. p. 292. C. Τοῖς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀσκούσιν, D.

a like exemption<sup>d</sup>: and likewise the Lycians, whose council was composed of members sent from twenty-three cities; in which council their magistrates were chosen, and their judicatories appointed. Here also they had been used to consult of peace and war; but this privilege the Romans took from them, so that for the future they were not to treat of peace and war, unless by their permission or for their advantage. Strabo adds that they managed this government of theirs so well, that they remained always free under the Romans to his time<sup>e</sup>. To these I might add the cities of Tarsus<sup>f</sup> and Byzantium, of which last Tully speaks when he accuses Piso of exercising jurisdiction in a free city contrary to the Roman laws<sup>g</sup>. There is no one, I think, can doubt whether these people had the power of putting persons subject to them to death in the execution of their own laws. How otherwise could it be said with any propriety, that they were not bound to obey the governors sent into the province? For if they themselves had not the power of inflicting corporal punishments and death, but the governor of the province had, most certainly they were bound to obey him, and that under the severest penalties: or

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Liv. l. 38. c. 39. l. 45. c. 20—25. et Epit. 46. Cic. ad Quint. Fratr. l. 1. ep. 1. c. 11. p. 1021, fin. ad famil. l. 12. c. 14. p. 815, pr.

<sup>e</sup> L. 14. p. 664, fin. 665, pr. Οὕτως δ' εὐνομουμένοις αὐτοῖς, συνέβη παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἐλευθέρους διατελέσαι.

<sup>f</sup> Julius Cæsar gave to the citizens of Tarsus χάραν, νόμους, τίμην, ἐξουσίαν τοῦ ποταμοῦ, &c. Dio Chrys. Orat. 34. p. 415, D. Vid. et Dio. Cassii l. 47. p. 342, A.

<sup>g</sup> Omitto jurisdictionem in libera civitate contra leges senatusque consulta. *De Prov. Consul.* c. 3, fin. p. 590, a. Oppidum Byzantium liberæ conditionis. *Plin.* l. 4. c. 11. p. 442, pr.



with what truth could Strabo relate that the Lycians were left free by the Romans, excepting only in the making peace and war, if at the same time the Romans took from them the execution of the punishments which their laws prescribed? most certainly that ought also to have been excepted. For what greater infringement of their liberty could they have suffered? On the contrary, though he tells us that in their convention or council they elected their magistrates and appointed their judicatories, he adds no limitation, no restriction whatever to their power in condemning and punishing of criminals<sup>h</sup>. We

<sup>h</sup> To the places already mentioned I might have added the island of Cyprus, which, after it was reduced to a province by Cato, was still governed by its own laws and magistrates, as is most evident from those words of Tully: *Q. Volusium, tui Tiberii generum, certum hominem, sed mirifice etiam abstinentem, misi in Cyprum, ut ibi pauculos dies esset; ne cives Romani pauci, qui illic negotiantur, jus sibi dictum negarent. Nam evocari ex insula Cyprios non licet. Ad Attic. l. 5. ep. ult. p. 906, pr.* Volusius was sent to Cyprus to administer justice to the few Romans that trafficked there; for the Cyprians, being wholly under their own laws and their own administration, had no need of a Roman magistrate among them. They had also this further privilege, that they could not be compelled upon any pretence to go out of their own island. Upon any differences therefore between Cyprians and Romans, forasmuch as the Romans could be judged only by their own magistrates, it was absolutely necessary a Roman judge should be sent to the island. Reflecting upon this passage, a doubt arises in my mind concerning the antiquity of that maxim of the civil law, *Merum imperium non posse transire*; for certainly in the case before us Tully delegated *merum imperium* to Volusius; otherwise the Romans might still complain that justice was denied them: unless it be taken for granted that no criminal causes could happen between the Cyprians and Romans in that happy island. Tully says, in the words immediately before those I have cited, *Quintum fratrem hybernis et Ciliciæ præ-*

read that both Lycians and Rhodians were afterwards deprived of their liberty, and the reasons given will serve further to explain this matter. Although to Strabo's time the Lycians were highly to be commended for the prudent administration of their republic, it was quite otherwise in the reign of the emperor Claudius, when they fell into dissensions and tumults, and put to death Roman citizens<sup>i</sup>. The Rhodians also crucified some Roman citizens<sup>k</sup>.

fecit. Can it be doubted whether he delegated criminal jurisdiction to his brother? I well know it is allowed by civilians, that in case of absence it might be done. I also know that it is a part of the civil law that the governor of a province should continue in his province, and administer justice there till the arrival of his successor; that he is not permitted to be absent from his province but in the single case of paying a vow, and even in that case not to lie one night out of the province under the severest penalty. Vid. l. 10. ff. de Off. Proc. et l. 15. ff. de Off. Præs. Nov. 8. c. 9. Nov. 95. c. 1. It seems not improbable to me that these two rules of law, that *merum imperium* should not be delegated, and that a governor should wait the arrival of his successor, grew up like twins together: that the latter was not necessary in the time of Tully is evident from his practice; for he left his province to the care of his quæstor, and affirms that the course of precedents was with him; Omnium fere exemplo, *ad Famil.* l. 2. ep. 15. et hujus rei plura exempla, *ad Attic.* l. 6. ep. 6. And the very laws quoted by civilians to prove that criminal jurisdiction might be delegated in case of absence, only shew that anciently the presidents were wont to leave their provinces before the arrival of their successors, l. 1. ff. de Off. ejus cui mand. est Jurisd. l. 1. §. 8. Ad Senat. Consult. Turpill.

<sup>i</sup> Lyciis ob exitiabiles inter se discordias libertatem ademit, Suet. Claud. c. 25. n. 11. Τούς τε Λυκίους στασιάζσαντας ὥστε καὶ Ῥωμαίους τινὰς ἀποκτεῖναι ἐδουλώσατο, Dio, l. 60. p. 676, C.

<sup>k</sup> Τῶν τε Ῥοδίων τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀφείλετο, ὅτι Ῥωμαίους τινὰς ἀνεσκολλήθησαν, Dio, l. 60. p. 681, B. It was twice taken from the Cyziceni for violence offered to the Romans, first by Augustus, be-

For these reasons were they deprived of the ancient freedom of living according to their own laws, as Dion expressly informs us. They greatly abused the liberty granted them, and exercised their power on those over whom they had no authority. For their power extended not to Roman citizens, as we shall see more fully hereafter. The Lycians, split into parties, probably in the choice of persons to sit in their council, became seditious, and their quarrels ended in the deaths of many, particularly of several Roman citizens. The Rhodians acted outrageously against law; for they not only put to death those whom they had no right to judge, but they put them to such a death, which, had they been Roman magistrates of the highest dignity, they had no authority to inflict: for it was contrary to law to crucify Roman citizens<sup>1</sup>.

Other places under the Romans had liberty of living according to their own laws allowed them, but in a more restrained manner; i. e. with more

cause they scourged some Romans to death, Dio, l. 54. p. 525, E. He a few years after restored them to their liberty again, Dio, l. 54. p. 537, D. It was taken away again by Tiberius, because they imprisoned some Romans, and finished not the temple which they had begun to erect for Augustus, Dio, l. 57. p. 619, D. because they attempted some violence on Roman citizens, Suet. Tib. 37. 7. 17. Vid. et Aug. 47. 2. 6. for their want of care in the ceremonies of Augustus, to which was added the crime of violence against Roman citizens, Tac. Ann. l. 4. 36. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Quos (scil. cives Romanos)—implorantes jura libertatis et civitatis in crucem sustulit, *Cic. in Ver.* l. 1. c. 3, pr. p. 268. Cum videant jus civitatis illo supplicio esse mactatum, *in Ver.* l. 4. c. 11, fin. p. 345, fin. The Rhodians notwithstanding, upon their repentance, and the oration which Nero made for them, were soon after restored to their liberty by Claudius. Suet. in Claud. c. 25. n. 11. et in Ner. c. 7. n. 8. et Tacit. Annal. l. 12. c. 58. n. 4.

exceptions and limitations. Thus Macedonia was divided by them into four parts, and the Macedonians were forbidden to contract marriage with any persons who did not inhabit in their own division. In like manner the sale of land and houses was not permitted to be made to persons inhabiting any other division, and confined to those of their own. They were not suffered to work in gold and silver, with several other particulars<sup>m</sup>. In Sicily, if a cause was depending between two persons who were Sicilians, and of the same city, it was to be tried by their own laws and judges in their own city. But if two Sicilians who were of different cities had a controversy, a judge was to be appointed by the Rupilian law. If a private person commenced a suit with a city or body corporate, or a body corporate with a private person, in case they could not agree that the senate either of that city to which the private person belonged, or that to which the body corporate belonged, should judge the affair, the senate of some other city was to be appointed. If a lawsuit arose between a Roman citizen and a Sicilian, if the Roman citizen was plaintiff, a Sicilian judge was to determine the cause; if the Sicilian was plaintiff, a Roman judge<sup>n</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> In quatuor regiones dividi Macedoniam—neque connubium neque commercium agrorum ædificiorumque inter se placere cuiquam extra fines regionis suæ esse, metalla quoque auri atque argenti non exerceri. *Liv.* l. 45. c. 29.

<sup>n</sup> Siculi hoc jure sunt, ut, quod civis cum cive agat, domi certet suis legibus: quod Siculus cum Siculo non ejusdem civitatis, ut de eo prætor judices ex P. Rupilii decreto, quod is de decem legatorum sententia statuit, quam legem illi Rupiliam vocant, sortitur. Quod privatus a populo petit, aut populus a privato: senatus ex aliqua civitate, qui judicet, datur, cum alternæ civitates

It was usual with the Romans to send persons into the nations they had conquered, to determine what alterations should be made in their ancient form of government, how far they should be under their own laws and judges, and how far under the Roman law. In Sicily this affair was settled by the decree of P. Rupilius the consul, formed by the advice of ten persons, who were sent to him from Rome on purpose to assist him herein<sup>o</sup>: in Macedonia by P. Æmilius, assisted also by ten legati<sup>p</sup>. Pompey, when

rejectæ sunt. Quod civis Romanus a Siculo petit, Siculus iudex datur: quod Siculus a cive Romano, civis Romanus datur, &c. *Cic. in Ver.* l. 2. c. 13, pr. p. 297. Suis legibus, i. e. Siculis. Et enim apud veteres non Romano tantum jure, sed et suæ cujusque civitatis legibus agebatur. Vid. Asconii notas in loc. et l. 2. C. de Jurisd. omnium.

<sup>o</sup> *Cic. in Ver.* l. 2. c. 13. Legem esse Rupiliam, quam P. Rupilius consul de decem legatorum sententia dedisset, c. 16. p. 298.

<sup>p</sup> *Liv.* l. 45. c. 17. 29. Leges Macedoniæ dedit cum tanta cura, ut non hostibus victis, sed sociis bene meritis dare videretur: et quas ne usus quidem longo tempore (qui unus est legum corrector) experiendo argueret, c. 32. med. It was the constant practice of the Romans, in settling the laws by which their new conquests were to be governed, to send ten persons to assist the general herein. These were usually persons of the greatest dignity, who had served the highest offices: Decem legati more majorum, quorum ex consilio, T. Quintius imperator leges pacis Philippo daret, decreti; adjectumque, ut in eo numero legatorum P. Sulpicius et P. Villius essent, qui consules provinciam Macedoniam obtinuissent. *Liv.* l. 33. c. 25. Vid. l. 37. c. 55. l. 38. c. 38. 47. Neque permissum est nobis ab hoc ordine, ut, bellis confectis, decem legatis permitti solet more majorum. *Cic. Phil.* 12. c. 12. p. 699, fin. Vid. de Prov. Consul. c. 11. (28) p. 592. *Ad Fam.* l. 1. ep. 7. p. 721, fin. *Ad Attic.* l. 13. ep. 6. p. 981, fin. et ep. 30. Polyb. Excerpt. Leg. ubique. To L. Anicius, general in Illyrium, there were but five sent. *Liv.* l. 45. c. 17. et 26. The only instance that I remember to have met with.



he had finished the Mithridatic war, did the same thing in Asia, as we are informed by Dio, there having been a great revolt of many of the Asiatic cities or states during that war<sup>q</sup>. And Hirtius relates of Julius Cæsar, that when he had finished the civil war at Alexandria he passed through Galatia and Bithynia into Asia; that he heard and determined the controversies of all those provinces, and gave laws to the tetrarchs, kings, and cities<sup>r</sup>. It was upon a like message, as I take it, that Quirinus was sent by Augustus into Judæa. Possibly for this reason Josephus styles him *δικαιδοτής τοῦ ἔθνους*<sup>s</sup>, the person who was to give law to that nation, or to settle how far they should be governed by their own laws, how far by the Roman law.

It is very certain that governors sent by the Romans into their provinces, if ill men, usually broke through these settlements, and exercised their authority where they ought not; so that under such lawless presidents the free districts and cities had little or no benefit of the privileges granted them. This was the case in Sicily when Verres was prætor. Tully tells us that neither Sicilian nor Roman had any benefit from the laws under his government<sup>t</sup>.

<sup>q</sup> Τά τε πλείω ἔθνη τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ τῇ ἡπείρῳ τότε αὐτοῖς ὄντων, νόμοις τε ἰδίαις καὶ πολιτείαις κατεστήσατο καὶ διεκόσμησεν. L. 37. p. 38, D. l. 5.

<sup>r</sup> Ita per Gallogræciam Bithyniamque in Asiam iter facit, omniumque earum provinciarum de controversiis cognoscit et statuit; jura in tetrarchas, reges, civitates distribuit. *De Bell. Alex.* c. 78, pr.

<sup>s</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 1, pr.

<sup>t</sup> Hæc omnia isto prætore non modo perturbata, sed plane et Siculis et civibus Romanis erepta sunt: primum suæ leges; quod civis cum cive ageret, aut eum judicem, quem commodum erat, præconem, haruspicem, medicum suum dabat: aut si legibus erat



Julius Cæsar, sensible how much these places, which had the freedom of their own laws, suffered by such governors, passed a law in his first consulship, that the free people should be truly free<sup>u</sup>. Notwithstanding, his father-in-law Piso soon after, being governor of Macedonia, made the whole country his property; in direct contradiction to the Julian law deprived cities of their freedom, and not only plundered them but the Roman citizens also who were among them<sup>x</sup>. This was so frequently the case of countries which had the liberty of their own magistrates and laws granted them by the Roman people,

*judicium constitutum, et ad civem suum judicem venerant, libere civi judicare non licebat. Edictum enim hominis cognoscite, &c.* If Verres at any time so far complied with the settlement as to give the proper judge appointed by law, he did not suffer him to pronounce freely according to his judgment; for he had reduced all under his own power by an edict he had made, that he would put to death those who gave a wrong judgment, i. e. such a one as he did not approve: and even the senates of cities had by this terror been compelled to pass sentence contrary to their own judgment of things. In Ver. l. 2. c. 13. Vid. et c. 14, 15, 16, &c.

<sup>u</sup> *Lege Cæsaris justissima atque optima populi liberi plane et vere erant liberi. Cic. in Pison. c. 16. p. 608.*

<sup>x</sup> *Lege autem ea, quam nemo legem, præter te et collegam tuam, putavit, omnis erat tibi Achaia, Thessalia, Athenæ, cuncta Græcia addicta. Ibid. Vexatio Macedonia? An sociorum direptio? An agrorum depopulatio? c. 17. (40.) Vid. et c. 36. (87.) Mitto ereptam libertatem populis, ac singulis, qui erant affecti præmiis nominatim, quorum nihil est, quod non sit lege Julia, ne fieri liceat, sancitum diligenter, c. 37. (90, fin.) Achaia exhausta: Thessalia vexata: laceratæ Athenæ: Dyrhachium et Apollonia exinanita:—cives Romani, qui in iis locis negotiantur, te unum, solum, suum depeculatorem, vexatorem, prædonem, hostem, venisse senserunt. Ibid. c. 40. (96) Onitto jurisdictionem in libera civitate contra leges senatusque consulta. De Prov. Consul. c. 3. (6, pr.)*

that if a governor was sent among them who had a regard to the settlement that had been made, and permitted them the use of their own laws, it was like life from the dead to them. Thus Tully says of some Asiatic cities, when he was proconsul of Cilicia, and had part of Asia joined to it, *Omnes suis legibus et judiciis usæ, ἀὐτονομίαν adeptæ, revixerunt*<sup>y</sup>. Restoring to them their ancient judicatories and form of government was restoring life itself.

It may be thought by some possibly, that if the greatest part of a province were free, and had their own magistrates and laws, there could be but little business for a governor, unless he broke in upon their privileges; that if he was observant of the settlements made, and discharged his duty as he ought, he must sit still the most of his time as an idle spectator of the government of others; i. e. of those magistrates who presided in the several little states or republics which filled his province. In answer to this, it is certain the provinces were at the time we are speaking of very large; that a great part of the free districts and cities had a more restrained liberty only, which the governor of the province was to see punctually observed according to the limitations made in their first and subsequent settlements. In all these places there was some use of the Roman law more or less, and not a little business for the governor: and in those countries which were most free, as we have observed Nemausus and Massilia to have been, all matters of state<sup>z</sup>, all affairs of peace

<sup>y</sup> Ad Attic. l. 6. ep. 2. p. 911, a. med.

<sup>z</sup> In matters of state kings themselves were to be obedient to the governors who were sent into the neighbouring provinces. Of this we have an example in Jos. Antiq. l. 19. c. 8. §. 1. where

and war <sup>a</sup>, and all cases of treason against the Roman people or emperors <sup>b</sup>, belonged wholly to the go-

he tells us that five kings being entertained by Agrippa at Tiberias, Marsus, president of Syria, taking umbrage at the meeting of so many kings, and suspecting it might not be for the interest of the Roman empire, ordered them immediately to separate, which accordingly they did. There is little or no reason to doubt but all kings subject to the Roman people promised obedience in such cases. *Petere regem, (scil. Antiochum)—imperaret sibi populus Romanus, quæ bono fidelique socio regi essent imperanda: se nullo usquam cessaturum officio. Liv. l. 42. c. 6.* Again, we are told of three kings that promised obedience in an affair of this nature: Eumenem, Antiochum, Ptolemæum pollicitos omnia, quæ populus Romanus imperasset, præstaturus. *Liv. l. 42. c. 26, pr. fin.* And at another time Antiochus says to the Roman ambassadors, *Faciam quod censet senatus*; and his ambassadors tell the Roman senate, *Eum haud secus, quam deorum imperio, legatorum Romanorum jussis paruisse*; and the senate answers, *Antiochum recte atque ordine fecisse, quod legatis paruisset. L. 45. c. 12, 13. et Polyb. Excerpt. Leg. 92. p. 916.*

<sup>a</sup> A condition imposed upon all conquered countries, as upon the Carthaginians; *Bellum neque in Africa, neve extra Africam injussu populi Romani gererent. Liv. l. 30. c. 37. et Polyb. l. 15. p. 705, D:* upon kings themselves, as for instance Philip: *Bellum extra Macedoniæ fines ne injussu senatus gereret. Liv. l. 33. c. 32.* and Antiochus: *Bellum gerendi jus Antiocho ne esto cum iis qui insulas colunt, neve in Europam transeundi. Liv. l. 38. c. 38. Polyb. Excerpt. Leg. 35. p. 840, fin. et 843, C:* and, no doubt, on all free states, as we have before observed concerning the republic of the Lycians. Titus Quintius commanded Diophanes, prætor of the Achæans, to march his army from Messene, to which he had laid siege, and come to him: which being complied with, he chid him, *Quod tantam rem sine auctoritate sua conatus esset*; and enjoined him to dismiss his army. *Liv. l. 36. c. 31. Vid. et l. 35. c. 46, fin. et c. 50, pr.*

<sup>b</sup> *Imperium majestatemque populi Romani gens Ætolorum conservato sine dolo malo. Liv. l. 38. c. 11. Polyb. Excerpt. Leg. 28. p. 832.* This seems to have been a condition imposed upon most of those who entered into alliance with the Romans; for

vernor. Let me add, that all places, even the most free, unless expressly exempted by some law made in their favour, paid tribute to the Romans<sup>c</sup>; and

Proculus, in describing a free people, says, *Liber autem populus est is, qui nullius alterius populi potestati est subjectus, sive is fœderatus est; item sive æquo fœdere in amicitiam venit, sive fœdere comprehensum est, ut is populus alterius populi majestatem comiter conservaret: hoc enim adjicitur, ut intelligatur alterum populum superiorem esse; non ut intelligatur alterum non esse liberum: quemadmodum clientes nostros intelligimus liberos esse, etiamsi neque auctoritate, neque dignitate, neque viribus nobis pares sunt: sic eos, qui majestatem nostram comiter conservare debent, liberos esse intelligendum est. L. 7. ff. de Captiv.* It is certain that in the latter part of the commonwealth, and the times following, far the most of those who entered into alliance with the Romans were joined, non æquo fœdere; and therefore it is probable were held to this condition. Hence it came to pass that they might be guilty *læsæ majestatis*, of treason against the Roman state, if they made war or raised an army without the leave of the Roman people, or if they supplied the enemies of the Romans with arms or provisions, or were the occasion that any foreign prince did not obey the Romans. *L. 3, 4. ff. ad Leg. Jul. Maj.* In this sense I take the last words of Proculus in the law before recited; *At fiunt apud nos rei ex civitatibus fœderatis, et in eos damnatos animadvertimus.* Proculus flourished at the end of the reign of Tiberius. *Vid. Grot. in Vit. Juriscon.*

<sup>c</sup> Thus the Macedonians were obliged, *tributum dimidium ejus, quod pependissent regibus, pendere populo Romano, Liv. l. 45. c. 29.* And many of the Greek cities in Asia were tributary, *Cic. ad Quint. Frat. l. 1. ep. 1. c. 11. p. 1021, fin. et 1022, pr. Tacit. Annal. l. 2. c. 47.* In a word, every place to which an immunity was not granted, as it was to the Corinthians, Phocenses, &c. *Liv. l. 33. c. 34. Val. Max. l. 4. c. 8. n. 5. to the Issenses, &c. Liv. l. 45. c. 26. fin. the Rhodians, Senec. de Benef. l. 5. c. 16, fin. the Apamæans, Plin. ep. l. 10. c. 56. the Batavi, Tacit. de Mor. Germ. c. 29.* Even some kings were tributary, such as Darius king of Pontus, Herod king of the Idumæans and Samaritans, Amyntas king of Pisidia, Polemo king of part of Cilicia, *Appian. Bell. Civ. l. 5. p. 715, D.*

that all causes which concerned the revenue were under the cognisance of the president of the province<sup>d</sup>; and I think also the inspection and examination of the accounts<sup>e</sup>: that in all places whatsoever Roman citizens were to be judged by the Roman laws, and were under the jurisdiction of the Roman governor<sup>f</sup>; and probably there was not a

<sup>d</sup> Quantum vero illud est beneficium tuum, quod iniquo et gravi vectigali ædilitiorum, magnis nostris simultatibus, Asiam liberasti? &c. Hic ita te versari, ut et publicanis satisfacias, (præsertim publicis male redemptis,) et socios perire non sinas, divinæ cujusdam virtutis esse videtur, i. e. tuæ, &c. &c. *Cic. ad Quint. Frat.* l. 1. ep. 1. c. 9, pr. c. 11, med. Duobus generibus edicendum putavi: quorum unum est provinciale, in quo est de rationibus civitatum, de ære alieno, de usura, de syngraphis; in eodem omnia de publicanis. *Ad Attic.* l. 6. ep. 1. p. 909, pr. Mira erant in civitatibus ipsorum furta Græcorum, quæ magistratus sui fecerant. Quæsivi ipse de iis, qui annis decem proximis magistratum gesserant: aperte fatebantur, &c. *Ad Att.* l. 6. ep. 2. p. 911, a. med. *Leg.* 1. C. de Off. Præf. August. Vid. Voet. in Pand. tit. de Off. Proc. Cæs. l. 11. ff. de Off. Præs. l. 6. §. 3, fin. eod. l. 9, pr. ff. de Off. Proc. et l. 2. C. ubi causæ fiscales.

<sup>e</sup> At least Philo tells us this was the business of the governors of Egypt, Ἀλλὰ καὶ λογισμοὺς τῶν προσόδων καὶ δασμῶν λαμβάνοντας, ὃν ἡ ἐξέτασις τὸν πλείονα τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ χρόνον ἀνήλυσκεν. In Flac. p. 984, C.

<sup>f</sup> Thus in Sicily, *Cic. in Ver.* l. 2. c. 13. and in Cyprus, *ad Attic.* l. 5. ep. ult. p. 906, pr. and the cities of Asia, Quid tibi tandem, Deciane, injuriæ factum est? Negotiaris in libera civitate. — Verum esto: negotiari libet: cur non Perganis? Smyrnæ? Trallibus? Ubi et multi cives Romani sunt et jus a nostro magistratu dicitur. *Pro Flacco*, c. 29. p. 493, pr. That Smyrna was a free city, governed by their own laws, vid. Polyb. Excerpt. *Leg.* 25. p. 821, fin. *Liv.* l. 38. c. 39. And Tully makes mention of them as fidelissimorum antiquissimorumque sociorum, *Phil.* 11. c. 2. p. 963, a. The inhabitants of Pergamus and Tralles were guilty of the basest treachery in the Mithridatic war; concerning which see *Cic. pro Flacco*, c. 24. p. 492, pr. et Appian. *Bell. Mithrid.* p. 185, C. et E. Yet it is the opinion of the great Span-



town of consideration in any province in which there were not many Roman citizens. The military forces also in every province were under the command of the president<sup>e</sup>. When these things are laid together and considered, there is no one but must see that a Roman governor had full business upon his hands without interfering with the free states under him, and breaking in upon their liberty. Philo says that the governors of Egypt were so overwhelmed with multiplicity of business, that suitors in their court were no small sufferers<sup>h</sup>.

It must be acknowledged that the liberty of all places was a precarious thing, depending wholly on the pleasure of the Roman people<sup>i</sup> or emperors, who granted it, and took it away as they saw fitting; so that we often read of many changes made in the condition of one and the same district or city, which was this while free, using their own laws, another while not so; then free again, and afterwards again

heim from several passages of Tully, Dio, and Plutarch, that they had their liberty restored either by Lucullus or Pompey. *Vid. Orb. Rom. p. 292.* Add to this what has been already said in the notes concerning the Lycians, Rhodians, and Cyziceni.

<sup>g</sup> *Veteres Romani—majoribus in provinciis magistratibus missis armorum juxta et legum potestatem fecissent—permissa scilicet prætoribus tam rei bellicæ administratione quam legum præscriptione. Nov. 24. præf. Ut idem et militaribus copiis, quæ per provinciam sunt, secundum cognomentum antiquitus illis impositum præeat, et præficiatur legibus. Ibid. c. 1.*

<sup>h</sup> Ἀμύχανον μὲν γὰρ ἦν τοὺς ἡγεμόνας τοσαύτης χώρας ἐπιτροπεύοντας, διὰ καινότερων ἐπεισερέντων ἰδιαδικῶν τε καὶ δημοσίων πραγμάτων ἀπάντων μεμνησθαι, &c. *Vid. et præcedentia. In Flac. p. 984, C.*

<sup>i</sup> *De jure enim libertatis et civitatis suum putat esse judicium, (i. e. populus Romanus) et recte putat. Cic. in Ver. l. 1. c. 5. (13, pr.)*



reduced under obedience to the Roman laws<sup>k</sup>. And as the greatest part of these free states paid tribute, they were generally so harassed and oppressed by the publicans, or farmers of the public taxes, that their liberty was of small advantage<sup>l</sup>. The gover-

<sup>k</sup> Thus the Greek cities in Europe, we have observed, were proclaimed free after the war with Philip king of Macedonia, Liv. l. 33. c. 32. This freedom, after the battle of Actium, was taken away from all the cities of Achaia, excepting Patræ, by Augustus. Pausan. Achai. p. 224. l. 18. Καὶ ἔδωκε μὲν ἐλευθέρους Ἀχαιῶν μόνοις τοῖς Πατρεῦσιν εἶναι. Dio, l. 51. p. 443, B. 9. Καὶ ὅς τὰς μὲν πόλεις χρημάτων τε εἰσπράξει, καὶ τῆς λοιπῆς ἐς τοὺς πολίτας σφῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐξουσίας παραιρέσει, μετῴλθε. Achaia was proclaimed free again by Nero at the Isthmian games. Suet. in Ner. c. 24. n. 6. Decedens, provinciam universam libertate donavit.—Quæ beneficia e medio stadio Isthmiorum die sua ipse voce pronuntiavit. Vid. Plut. Flamin. p. 376, C. Their liberty was soon after taken away again by Vespasian. Achaia—libertate adempta. Suet. in Vesp. c. 8. n. 9. Pausan. Achai. p. 222. l. 25. Many of their cities or states were free again under Trajan. Plin. l. 8. ep. 24. Cogita te missum in provinciam Achaia—ad ordinandum statum liberarum civitatum.—Te vero meminisse oportet—quale quantumque sit ordinare statum liberarum civitatum. Nam quid ordinatione civilius? Quid libertate pretiosius? Porro quam turpe, si ordinatio eversione, libertas servitute mutetur? The Rhodians were great favourites in the war with Antiochus, Liv. l. 38. c. 39.; were quite out of favour in the war with Perseus, Liv. l. 44. c. 14, 15. and l. 45. c. 25.; afterwards upon great entreaties restored to friendship, Epit. 46. Their liberty was taken away by Claudius, and restored again at the intercession of Nero by the same emperor, Dio, l. 60. p. 681, B. Tacit. Ann. l. 12. c. 58. n. 3.; taken away again by Vespasian, Sex. Rufus in Breviario, c. 10, fin. Suet. in Vesp. c. 8. n. 9. They were free again under Trajan. Dio Chrys. Orat. 32. p. 377, C.

<sup>l</sup> Illa causa publicanorum quantam acerbiter afferrat sociis, intelleximus ex civibus, qui nuper in portoriis Italiae tollendis, non tam de portorio, quam de nonnullis injuriis portitorum querebantur. Quare non ignoro, quid sociis accadat in ultimis terris, cum

nors also who were sent among them, as we have already observed, allowed them no more liberty than they saw fit, and often treated them more like slaves than freemen<sup>m</sup>. These things however make it not at all the less true, that there were very many places under the Romans to whom the supreme ruling powers, whether it were the senate, the people, or the emperor, granted the privilege of being governed by their own laws and their own magistrates.

#### SECT. VI.

*The Romans were peculiarly favourable to the Jews, and allowed them singular privileges in all parts of the empire.*

SECONDLY, it is also certain that the Jews were indulged the peculiar favour of being in a great measure under their own laws, even out of Judæa, in all parts of the Roman empire, wheresoever they dwelt<sup>n</sup>. They were permitted to build synagogues, assemble

audierim in Italia querelas civium. Hic te ita versari, ut et publicanis satisfacias—et socios perire non sinas, divinæ cujusdam virtutis esse videtur. *Cic. ad Quint. Frat. l. 1. ep. 1. c. 11.* The senate of Rome themselves say, Et ubi publicanus est, ibi aut jus publicum vanum, aut libertatem sociis nullam esse. *Liv. l. 45. c. 18, med.*

<sup>m</sup> Some of these considerations probably made Tully smile, when he wrote to his friend Atticus concerning the liberty of the Greek cities: Sibi libertatem censent Græci datam, ut Græci inter se disceptent suis legibus—Græci vero exultant, quod peregrinis judiciis utuntur, nugatoribus quidem, inquires. Quid refert? tamen se αὐτονομίαν adeptos putant. Vestri enim, credo, graves habent, Turpionem sutorium, et Vettium mancipem. *Ad Att. l. 6. ep. 1. p. 909, a, fin.*

<sup>n</sup> Nullo adeo in ævo fere non erat hoc nationi huic singulare suis fere legibus alieno in regno seu republica uti. *Seld. de Success. in bon. Prol. p. 10.*

together on Saturdays and holydays to hear their law explained, keep their festivals, and perform whatever rites were prescribed them<sup>o</sup>. They were

<sup>o</sup> The Halicarnasseans, in imitation of the Romans, and in obedience to what they had wrote to them, decree that the Jews, both men and women, keep their sabbaths and perform their holy rites according to their own laws, καὶ τὰς προσευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι, and build Proseuchæ, or say their prayers near the sea, according to their own country manner, and that whoever should hinder them, whether magistrate or private person, should be fined. Jos. Antiq. l. 14. c. 10. §. 23. The senate and people of Sardis agree to the petition of the Jews, that they may have a place given them, in which they may assemble with their wives and children, to perform their prayers, and other holy rites, to God, and decree that it may be lawful for them to meet together upon the appointed days, to do according to their own laws. Ibid. §. 24. There is a decree of the Ephesians to the same purpose, §. 25. and both these decrees were made in obedience to the Romans. Publius Servilius Galba the proconsul is displeased with the Milesians for prohibiting the Jews to observe their sabbaths and other holy rites, and decrees that the Jews should not be hindered in the use of their own customs. Ibid. §. 21. There is a decree of a Roman prætor directed to the magistrates of Parium, (a city of Mysia near the Propontis. The prætor being now at Delos, probably misled the learned Hudson to translate it *Pariorum*, which signifies the inhabitants of the island of Parus, whenas Παριάνων are the inhabitants of Parium, vid. Strab.) wherein the prætor shews his displeasure, that they had by their decree forbad the Jews to live according to their own customs, and to contribute money for their feasts and other holy rites, when they were not prohibited the doing this even at Rome. For, adds the prætor, Caius Cæsar, our prætor and consul, when by an edict he forbad, θιάσους συνάγεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν, μόνους τούτους οὐκ ἐκάλυπεν, οὔτε χρήματα συνεισφέρειν, οὔτε σύνδειπνα ποιεῖν, all other merry and festival meetings, he forbad not the Jews to collect money, and feast together. In like manner I also, forbidding all other festival assemblies, permit to this people only to meet together, and feast according to their country customs and laws, (ἵστασθαι undoubtedly ought to be read ἐστιῶσθαι.) ibid. §. 8. Philo says, that Augustus knew that the

allowed to meet to pay their first-fruits, and to send them together with whatever money they pleased to Jerusalem for offerings <sup>p</sup>, and to appoint proper offi-

Jews at Rome had synagogues, and that they met together in them, especially on the holy seventh days, when they publicly taught their own country philosophy.—He did not innovate in their synagogues, nor forbid them to meet together for the exposition of their laws. *Leg. ad Caium*, p. 1014, D. E. And they enjoyed the same privileges under Tiberius. *Ibid.* p. 1015, B. This is also in great measure evident from the Roman authors. *Jejunia sabbatariorum. Mart.* l. 4, 4. In qua te quæro prosequenda. *Juv.* Hodie tricesima sabbatha; vin' tu Curtis Judæis oppedere? *Hor. Sat.* l. 1. 9. Ne Judæus quidem, mi Tiberi, tam diligenter sabbathis jejunium servat, quam ego hodie servavi. *Aug. in Suet.* c. 76. n. 3.

<sup>p</sup> *Philo in Leg. ad Caium*, p. 1014, D. E. p. 1033, A. Augustus hearing that the first-fruits were neglected, wrote to the governors of the provinces in Asia, to permit the Jews only to assemble for banqueting. For that these were not assemblies of drunkenness and debauchery, (alluding plainly to the *θίασος* forbidden in the decree of Caius Cæsar before recited,) to cause riots and disturbance, but were schools of sobriety and righteousness, of men studying virtue, and bringing in their yearly first-fruits, of which they offer sacrifices, sending holy messengers to the temple at Jerusalem. Then he commanded that none should hinder the Jews from assembling, contributing their money, or sending to Jerusalem after their country manner. Then follows a letter of Norbanus, containing an epistle of Augustus to him: "That the Jews, wherever they are, should, according to their ancient custom, meet together, bring in their money, and send it to Jerusalem." *Ibid.* p. 1035, D. E. 1036, A. B. We have the letter of Augustus Cæsar to Norbanus in *Jos. Antiq.* l. 16. c. 6. §. 3. "The Jews, wherever they are, by an ancient custom, are wont to bring their money together, and to send it to Jerusalem: let them do this without hinderance." In consequence hereof Norbanus wrote to the Sardians, *Jos. ibid.* §. 6. and Ephesians, *Philo Leg. ad Caium*, p. 1036, A. and probably to all the other cities and states under his government. Agrippa wrote to the Ephesians, that whoever should steal the sacred money of

cers to carry it <sup>q</sup>. They were suffered also to determine all disputes and controversies among themselves in a judicial way <sup>r</sup>. They were not only thus

the Jews, and fly to an asylum, should be taken from thence and delivered to the Jews, (in order to be prosecuted and punished,) in the same manner as sacrilegious persons were to be dragged from all asylums. Jos. Antiq. l. 16. c. 6. §. 4. He sent also to the magistrates of Cyrene, putting them in mind that Augustus had wrote to Flavius the prætor of Libya, and to others, who had the care of that province, that the Jews might send their sacred money to Jerusalem without let or hinderance, commanding the Cyrenians to restore what had been stopped or taken away from the Jews under pretence of tribute, and to prevent the like hinderance for the future. Ibid. §. 5. Augustus decreed that the stealing of their sacred books or their sacred money, out of the places in which they were wont to be repositied in their synagogues, should be sacrilege, and the punishment confiscation of goods. Ibid. §. 2. Vid. et de Bell. Jud. l. 6. c. 6. §. 2. p. 1284, fin.

<sup>q</sup> Στέλλοντες ιεροπομποὺς εἰς τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἱερόν. Phil. Leg. ad Caium, p. 1035, fin. Τοὺς εἰς ταῦτα ἀποκεκριμένους. Jos. Antiq. l. 16. c. 6. §. 5, fin.

<sup>r</sup> It is a most remarkable letter sent by Lucius Antonius, pro-quæstor and pro-prætor, to the magistrates, senate, and people of Sardis: "The Jews, our citizens, (i. e. citizens of Rome,) came to me, and made proof that they have had of ancient time a synod of their own, according to their own country laws, and a place of their own, in which they judicially determine causes and disputes between each other. Having petitioned me that it may be lawful for them to do this, I have decreed to permit them." Jos. Antiq. l. 14. c. 10. §. 17. Ἰουδαῖοι πολῖται ἡμέτεροι προσελθόντες μοι ἐπέδειξαν ἑαυτοὺς σύνοδον ἔχειν ἰδίαν κατὰ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, καὶ τόπον ἴδιον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ τε πράγματα καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀντιλογίας κρίνουσι. Τοῦτό τε αἰτησαμένοις, ἡ ἐξῆ ἀυτοῖς ποιεῖν, τηρῆσαι καὶ ἐπιτρέψαι ἔκρινα. Though this was a free city, yet the persons who applied themselves to the pro-prætor, being Roman citizens, were under his jurisdiction; notwithstanding, being Jews as well as Romans, he allows them to determine their own controversies among themselves by their own laws.



indulged in the use of their own customs and laws, but, what is much more, if any laws of the country where they inhabited interfered with their customs they were dispensed with, and not obliged to comply with those laws. Thus, for instance, they were dispensed with in not attending courts of judicature or giving bail on their sabbaths or feast-days<sup>s</sup>. They were exempted from serving in the Roman army<sup>t</sup>,

<sup>s</sup> The Jews of Ionia complain to Agrippa, that by the injustice of the magistrates they were forced into their judicial courts on their feast-days, and made to serve both in the army and in civil employments, contrary to the privileges granted them by the Romans, and Agrippa relieved them. Jos. Antiq. l. 16. c. 2. §. 3, 4, 5. And upon complaint made by the Jews of Asia and Libya, Augustus decreed that they should not be obliged to give in bail on the sabbath-days, or on the preparation before the sabbath from the ninth hour, i. e. on Friday, after three of the clock in the afternoon. Ibid. c. 6. §. 1, 2. And Agrippa wrote to Silanus, prætor of Asia, to the same purpose, §. 4. fin. Ἐγραψα δὲ καὶ Σιλανῷ τῷ στρατηγῷ, ἵνα σάββασι μηδεὶς ἀναγκάζῃ Ἰουδαῖον ἐργίας ὁμολογεῖν.

<sup>t</sup> Dolabella, president of Asia, having received an embassy from Hyrcanus, informing him that the Jews were incapable of being soldiers in the Roman army, because they could not bear arms, nor march, nor provide their own victuals on the sabbath-days; writes to the Ephesians, and by them to all the cities of Asia, granting to the Jews (as he says the governors before him had done) a freedom from serving in the army, and the use of their own customs, to assemble for the performance of their sacred rites, and to make contributions for their sacrifices. Jos. Antiq. l. 14. c. 10. §. 12. Lucius Lentulus the consul pronounces a decree, whereby he dismisses the Jews at Ephesus, who were Roman citizens, from the military service, upon the account of religion. Ibid. §. 13. Being Roman citizens, they were liable by the Roman law to have been enlisted, had it not been for this immunity or exemption. Vid. et §. 16, 18, 19. Therefore Marcus Piso, when he came to Delos to enlist soldiers, commanded the prætor and people of that city, that if there were any Jews among them, who were Roman citizens, they should not trouble them by en-



and from all those civil offices which were inconsistent with their religion; as appears by the decrees of Augustus, Agrippa, and several Roman governors to this purpose <sup>u</sup>. So that Seneca affirms of them, that they gave law to their conquerors <sup>x</sup>.

And it is not a little remarkable how very condescending and kind the emperor Augustus was to this people. For in his monthly distributions of money and corn to the people of Rome, as he gave to the Jews equal to what he did to the rest, so if it happened that the distribution was made on their sabbath-day, when they think it unlawful to receive money, he, knowing their scruple, ordered it to be

listing them, because the consul Cornelius Lentulus had freed the Jews from serving in the army upon the account of their religion. And the Delians made a decree that this order should be observed. The Sardians made a decree to the same effect. *Ibid.* §. 14.

<sup>u</sup> Λειτουργῶν ἀναγκαζόμενοι κοινωνεῖν, *Jos. Antiq.* l. 16. c. 2. §. 3. med. Καὶ ταῖς ἑορταῖς ἄγοντες ἐπὶ δικαστήρια, καὶ πραγματείας ἄλλας, *ibid.* §. 4. p. 711, pr. Though these laws were broke in upon by Caligula, they were confirmed by Claudius, *Jos. Antiq.* l. 19. c. 5. §. 2, 3, who commanded the magistrates of all cities, colonies, and municipia, both within Italy and without, as also all kings and potentates, to procure a copy of his decree, made in favour of the Jews, and to expose it where it might be read by all. *Vid. et c.* 6. §. 3. And were preserved by the succeeding emperors, as is evident from the speech made by Titus. *De Bell. Jud.* l. 6. c. 6. §. 2. p. 1284, fin.

<sup>x</sup> Cum interim usque eo sceleratissimæ gentis consuetudo convalluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit: victi victoribus leges dederunt. *Apud Aug. de Civ. Dei* l. 6. c. 11. And Dio says they prevailed; "Ὡστε καὶ παρῆρσίαν (vel εἰς παρῆρσίαν) τῆς νομίσεως ἐκνικῆσαι. *L.* 36. p. 37, B. *Vid. Seld. de Success. in bon. Prol.* p. 9, 10.

laid up in safe custody for them till the next day<sup>γ</sup>. Is it reasonable to think that a people so peculiarly favoured in all parts of the Roman empire out of their own country, should not in their country be governed by their own laws and their own magistrates, a privilege so commonly granted by the Romans, as we have seen, to other countries?

### SECT. VII.

*The Jews petitioned the emperor Augustus that their country might be made a Roman province, with this view, that they might have the free use of their own laws.*

THIRDLY, it is also fully evident from Josephus, that it was the earnest desire of the Jews that they might be no longer under a king of their own, but under a Roman governor; and that the true reason why they so earnestly sought to have their country annexed to the province of Syria was, that they might have the free use of their own laws. When Archelaus went to Rome to obtain of Augustus the confirmation of his father's will, even his relations and friends joined themselves to his brother and competitor Antipas, (who had been named by his father Herod in a former will as the person he designed should succeed him in his kingdom,) not out of good-will to Antipas, but out of hatred to Arche-

<sup>γ</sup> Οὐ μὲν ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς μηνιαίαις τῆς πατρίδος διανομαῖς, ἀργύριον ἢ σῆτον ἐν μέρει παντὸς τοῦ δήμου λαμβάνοντος, οὐδέποτε τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἡλάττωσε τῆς χάριτος, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ συνέβη τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐβδόμης ἐνεστῶσης γενέσθαι τὴν διανομήν, ὅτε οὔτε λαμβάνειν οὔτε διδόναι, ἢ συνόλως τὶ πράττειν τῶν κατὰ βίον, καὶ μάλιστα τὸν ποριστὴν ἐφεῖται, προσετέτακτο τοῖς διανέμουσι ταμιεύειν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἰς τὴν ὑστεραίαν τὴν κοινὴν φιλάνθρωπίαν. Phil. Leg. ad Caium, p. 1015, A.

laus, chiefly, nevertheless, because they desired freedom, and to be under a Roman governor<sup>z</sup>. And this was the general desire of the whole nation<sup>a</sup>, who, with the consent of Varus the president of Syria, despatched an embassy to Rome to ask for the freedom of being governed by their own laws<sup>b</sup>: and that this petition might come with the more weight, no fewer than fifty persons are by the decree of the nation sent on this embassy<sup>c</sup>, to whom, when they arrive at Rome, above eight thousand Jews of that city join themselves<sup>d</sup>, and appear with them before Cæsar<sup>e</sup>. He gives them a hearing, and the sum of their petition is, that they may no longer be governed by a king, but be made part of the province of Syria, and be subject to the presidents which are sent thither<sup>f</sup>. Josephus relates exactly the same thing in the book of the Jewish Wars; says that all the relations of the family who hated Archelaus did what in them lay to assist Antipas at

<sup>z</sup> Μάλιστα μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦντες ἐλευθερίας, καὶ ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγῷ τετάχθαι. *Antiq.* l. 17. c. 9. §. 4. prop. fin.

<sup>a</sup> Διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς εἶναι τοὺς αὐτονομίας γλιχομένους. *Ibid.* c. 13. §. 1, fin.

<sup>b</sup> Ἀφίκετο εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην πρεσβεία Ἰουδαίων Οὐάρου τὸν ἀπόστολον αὐτῶν τῷ ἔθνει ἐπικεχωρηκότος ΥΠΕΡ ΑΙΤΗΣΕΩΣ ΑΥΤΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ. *Ibid.* prop. pr.

<sup>c</sup> Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μὲν πρέσβεις οἱ ἀποσταλέντες ΓΝΩΜΗ ΤΟΥ ΕΘΝΟΥΣ ΠΕΝΤΗΚΟΝΤΑ.

<sup>d</sup> Συνίσταντο δὲ αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης Ἰουδαίων ὑπὲρ ὀκτακισχιλίους. *Ibid.* l. 9, 10, 11.

<sup>e</sup> Οἱ μὲν πρέσβεις μετὰ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν αὐτόθι Ἰουδαίων ἀφικνοῦνται, i. e. into the court held upon this occasion by Augustus Cæsar. *Ibid.* l. 14.

<sup>f</sup> Ἦν δὲ κεφάλαιον αὐτοῖς τῆς ἀξιώσεως, βασιλείας μὲν καὶ τοιῶνδε ἀρχῶν ἀπηλλάχθαι, προσθήκην δὲ Συρίας γεγονότας ὑποτάσσεσθαι τοῖς ἐκεῖσε πεμπομένοις στρατηγοῖς. *Ibid.* §. 2, fin.

Rome; and the principal reason was, because every one of them desired that the nation might live in the use of their own laws under the administration of a Roman governor; but if they failed of this, they had rather Antipas should be king than Archelaus<sup>e</sup>. He adds also, that by the permission of Varus fifty ambassadors were sent to Rome, and that their instructions were to obtain for the nation a freedom of living after their own laws<sup>h</sup>; that above eight thousand Jews stood with them before Cæsar<sup>i</sup>; and that their petition was, that, being joined to Syria, the government of their country might be administered by Roman presidents<sup>k</sup>.

He that will compare these passages together must be convinced that the Jews did not understand, by having their country annexed to Syria, and under the power of a Roman governor, that they were to be deprived of their own laws and magistrates; but, on the contrary, that they should hereby obtain a more free and regular administration of their laws than they had enjoyed under their late king Herod, and that their magistrates would be less obstructed in the execution of them than they were under him. For although you see nothing appears in their peti-

<sup>e</sup> Καὶ προηγουμένως μὲν ἕκαστος αὐτονομίας ἐπεθύμει, στρατηγῶν Ῥωμαίων διοικουμένης· εἰ δὲ τούτου διαμαρτάνοιεν, βασιλεῦειν Ἀντίπαν ᾗθελον. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 2. §. 3, fin.

<sup>h</sup> Ἐπιτρέψαντος Οὐάρου, πρέσβεις ἐξεληλύθησαν ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΕΘΝΟΥΣ ΑΤΤΟΝΟΜΙΑΣ. Ἦσαν δὲ πεντήκοντα μὲν οἱ παρόντες.

<sup>i</sup> Συμπαρίσταντο δὲ αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης Ἰουδαίων ὑπὲρ ὀκτακισχιλίους—μετὰ μὲν τῶν πρεσβευτῶν τὸ Ἰουδαϊκὸν πλῆθος ἔστη. Ibid. c. 6. §. 1, pr.

<sup>k</sup> Δεῖσθαι δὲ Ῥωμαίων ἐλεῆσαι τε τὰ τῆς Ἰουδαίας λείψανα—συνάψαντας δὲ τῇ Συρίᾳ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν διοικεῖν ὑπὸ ἰδίῳις ἡγεμόσιν. Ibid. §. 2. p. 1057. l. 5, &c.

tion to Augustus, but that they might be joined to the province of Syria, yet the reason of this request, we are expressly told by Josephus, was their desire of liberty, that they might have a more free use of their laws than they were lately permitted. It was this desire made the family of Herod take part with Antipas (who had the weaker claim) against Archelaus, hoping hereby to prevail, that both might at length be set aside. It was this desire made the nation of the Jews apply to Varus for his consent to their despatching an embassy to Rome. It was this desire made them send so great a number of ambassadors. To use their endeavours to obtain this desired liberty were the instructions given to this numerous body. It was this desire also made the Jews at Rome join with them, and fill up their train. Nothing therefore can be more plain, than that they expected to have a more free exercise of their own laws under a Roman governor than they had under Herod: and had not their magistrates in the reign of Herod the power of inflicting corporal punishments and death in the execution of the Mosaic laws? I am persuaded no one ever doubted it. Most certainly, then, the Jews did not in the least suspect that they should be deprived of this power under a Roman governor; but, on the contrary, believed that they should enjoy the exercise of it in a more full and ample manner than they had done under Herod. Had they known that they were to have entirely lost it by receiving a Roman governor, they would have chosen rather to have suffered any hardships under a king of their own. Every one knows how fond persons usually are of ancient customs and laws. It is certain that no people upon

the face of the earth ever were more so than the Jews, who have always shewn a steady, constant, and, I may add, most obstinate adherence to their own customs<sup>1</sup>, from which no sufferings could ever make them swerve. Besides, with what propriety or truth could it be said that it was the desire of living after their own laws which induced them to petition for a Roman governor, if they knew at the same time, that, by obtaining what they asked, they should have less the exercise of their own laws than they had before?

#### SECT. VIII.

*The reasons we have to believe that the emperor Augustus granted to the Jews what they had in view in this petition.*

FOURTHLY, there are many reasons to persuade us that the emperor Augustus did comply with the intent of the petition we have mentioned, after he banished Archelaus: and although he appointed a governor, and gave him power over all<sup>m</sup>, yet at the same time allowed the Jews the liberty of their own laws, in the execution of which their magistrates might inflict corporal punishments, and death itself. For,

First, It is evident the emperor Augustus was

<sup>1</sup> "Ἦδει γὰρ ἀνθ' ἐνὸς θανάτου μυρίους ἂν, εἴπερ δυνατὸν ἦν, ἐβελήσοντας ἱπομεῖναι μᾶλλον, ἢ περιδεῖν τι τῶν ἀπειρημένων δρόμενον. "Απαντες γὰρ ἄνθρωποι φυλακτικῶι τῶν ἰδίων ἐθῶν εἰσι, διαφερόντως δὲ τὸ Ἰουδαῖον ἔθνος. Θεόχρηστα γὰρ λόγια τοὺς νόμους εἶναι ὑπολαμβάνοντες, καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας τὸ μάθημα παιδευθέντες, ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς, &c. Philo Leg. ad Caium, p. 1099, C. l. 9.

<sup>(1)</sup> Καπάνιός τε αὐτῷ συγκαταπέμπεται—ἡγησόμενος Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσία. Jos. Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 1.



ready enough to grant people the liberty of living under their own magistrates and their own laws. He continued this privilege to most of those places which enjoyed it before his time <sup>n</sup>; and he gave it to many who before were without it <sup>o</sup>, particularly in Gaul <sup>p</sup>, Spain <sup>q</sup>, Crete <sup>r</sup>, if not also in Germany <sup>s</sup>.

2dly, The great kindness which upon all other occasions he discovered to the Jewish nation, renders it highly probable that he would not deny them this request. I have already shewn from several decrees of his, and of his favourite minister Agrippa, how willing he was to confirm their immunities and privileges; what care he took their sacred money should be secure, and conveyed to Jerusalem without

<sup>n</sup> Ἦδεισαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, καὶ ὅτι τοσαύτην ποιεῖται τῆς βεβαιώσεως τῶν παρ' ἐκάστοις πατρίων, ὅσῃν καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν. Philo Leg. ad Caium, p. 1014, B. l. 5. Τὰ δὲ, εἰ καὶ τότε ἤδη ἐκεχείρωτο, ἀλλ' οὕτοιγε καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἤρχητο, ἀλλ' ἢ αὐτόνομα ἀφεῖτο, ἢ καὶ βασιλείαις τισὶν ἐπιτέτραπτο. Dio, l. 53. p. 504, B. l. 3. Ὁ δὲ δὴ Αὔγουστος τὸ μὲν ἐπήκοον κατὰ τὰ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἔθη διέκει, τὸ δὲ ἔνσπονδον τῇ πατρίᾳ σφίσι τρόπῳ αἰεὶ ἄρχεσθαι. L. 54. p. 526, C.

<sup>o</sup> Οὗτος ὁ τὰς πόλεις ἀπάσας εἰς ἐλευθερίαν ἐξελόμενος. Philo Leg. ad Caium, p. 1013, C.

<sup>p</sup> Ὁ γοῦν Αὔγουστος ἐπειδὴ περ πάντα τὰ τε ἐν ταῖς Γαλατίαις, καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς Γερμανίαις, ταῖς τ' Ἰβηρίαις, πολλὰ μὲν ἀναλώσας ὥς ἐκάστοις, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ παρ' ἐτέρων λαβὼν, τὴν τ' ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν τοῖς μὲν δοῦς, τοῖς δ' ἀφελόμενος, διακλήσατο. Dio, l. 54. p. 538, fin. The great Spanheim conjectures that the Nervii, Suessiones, Ulpianctes, Leuci, Treveri, mentioned by Pliny as free, l. 4. §. 31. and Secusiani, §. 32. had their liberty given them by Augustus. Vid. Orb. Rom. p. 351.

<sup>q</sup> Oppida libertate donata sex. Plin. l. 3. §. 3. This, Spanheim conjectures, was done by Augustus. Vid. ibid.

<sup>r</sup> Κυδωνεάτας τε καὶ Λαππαίους ἐλευθέρους ἀφῆκεν. Dio, l. 51. p. 443, D.

<sup>s</sup> Dio, l. 54. p. 538, fin.

let or hinderance. Philo also tells us that he appointed a bullock and two lambs to be sacrificed daily as whole burnt-offerings to the most high God at the temple of Jerusalem, and the expenses to be defrayed out of his own revenue<sup>t</sup>: and both he and his empress Livia adorned the temple with many rich presents<sup>u</sup>.

3dly, It is also, I think, sufficiently evident from the History of Josephus, that he actually did grant what they desired. He annexed their country to the province of Syria, and placed over them a Roman governor, who was under the president of Syria<sup>x</sup>. This is all that appears upon the face of their petition; and thus much, it is certain, was granted. And why may we not suppose that they obtained the spirit as well as letter of their petition, and were gratified in the end for which they so earnestly sought this alteration? Is there any thing related by Josephus which shews the contrary? Is there any one word throughout his whole history which will prove that the Jewish nation were not governed

<sup>t</sup> Leg. ad Caium, p. 1014. fin. et p. 1036, C.

<sup>u</sup> Καὶ ἡ προμάμμη σου Ἰουλίᾳ Σεβαστῇ κατεκόσμησε τὸν νεὸν χρυσαῖς φιάλαις καὶ σπονδεῖοις, καὶ ἄλλων ἀναθεμάτων πολυτελεστάτων πλήθει. Agrippa in Phil. Leg. ad Caium, p. 1036, D. Ἀπέσχετο δ' οὐδὲ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ πεμφθέντων ἀκρατοφόρων. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖς ἐτίμησάν τε καὶ προσέκόσμησαν τὸ ἱερὸν αἰεί. Jos. Bell. Jud. l. 5. c. ult. §. 6. p. 1256, pr.

<sup>x</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 17, fin. et l. 18, pr. Παρῇν δὲ καὶ Κυρήνιος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίων προσθήκην τῆς Συρίας γενομένην. Vitellius, president of Syria, sent Pilate to Rome to give an account of his conduct, and placed Marcellus his friend in his room. Antiq. l. 18. c. 5. §. 2. Thus also Ummidius Quadratus, president of Syria, sent Cumanus, governor of Judæa, to Italy, to give an account of his behaviour. Antiq. l. 20. c. 5. §. 2. p. 889, fin.

by their own laws, or that their magistrates had not the power of inflicting corporal punishments and death in the execution of their laws? Is it not natural to suppose, that had they been deprived of these rights, Josephus would have taken particular and express notice of it? Nay, was it not incumbent on him as an historian so to do? When he had before told us of the petition offered by the Jewish nation, of the great solemnity of the embassy sent therewith, of the numerous body of Jews which attended when it was presented to Augustus, and of the end for which they so eagerly desired his compliance and favourable answer; if, after this petition was granted, they found themselves disappointed in the end they proposed to themselves by offering it, and were not allowed the free use of their own laws, at least not the execution of them in all capital causes; was it not, I say, incumbent on him as an historian to have related this? Most certainly it was; and the neglect hereof is too gross an error to charge on such a writer. It is true, the petition was not granted till eight or nine years<sup>y</sup> after it was presented. But this is no manner of excuse for Josephus, because the facts mentioned by him as happening during this interval of time are so very few, and the relation of them is in so narrow a compass,

<sup>y</sup> Josephus herein differs from himself. In his *Antiquities*, he says Archelaus was banished in the tenth year of his reign; in the *Jewish Wars*, in the ninth. *Antiq.* l. 17. c. ult. §. 2, 3. *De Bell. Jud.* l. 2. c. 7. §. 3. Is it not possible to reconcile him thus? May he not in his *Antiquities* reckon his reign from the time of his father's death? in his *Jewish Wars*, from the time Augustus confirmed his father's will, and made him ethnarch?

that they could never make him forget so material a part of his History as this.

It seems, such was the friendship which Augustus had for Herod the Great, that, willing first to try how his children would behave, he postponed the petition of the Jewish nation, and divided the kingdom among three of them. The one half of it he bestowed on Archelaus, with an express charge that he should be gentle to his subjects<sup>z</sup>. He gave him the title of ethnarch, with a promise that, if he behaved worthily, he should have that of king conferred on him<sup>a</sup>. But he, neglecting the charge given him, was cruel, and after a reign of nine years, being accused, was banished to Vienna, a city of Gaul<sup>b</sup>. Then Augustus literally answered the petition which the Jews offered to him nine years before. He did not prefer any other of Herod's children to the vacant ethnarchy, but joined it to the province of Syria. He nominated Quirinus, a person of the highest dignity, president of Syria, and sent him into Judæa, not only to confiscate the goods of Archelaus, and make a Roman census<sup>c</sup>, i. e. a survey and enrolment of the estate and goods belonging to each person; but, as I take it, to settle the new government, and give laws to the Jews<sup>d</sup>; i. e. to prescribe

<sup>z</sup> "Ἰνα ἐπιεικῶς ἀναστρέφῃται πρὸς αὐτούς. Antiq. l. 17. c. ult. §. 2. p. 788. l. 12.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. c. 13. §. 4, pr. et de Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 6. §. 3, pr.

<sup>b</sup> De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 7. §. 3. Antiq. l. 17. c. ult. §. 2.

<sup>c</sup> Antiq. l. 17, fin. et l. 18, pr.

<sup>d</sup> As Pompey and Gabinius had done before him, and as the general, with the advice of the *decem legati*, were wont to do under the ancient republic.

what should be the authority of their magistrates, how far they should use their own laws, what should be the power of the Roman governor among them, and whatever other particulars he should think might conduce to the public weal. Coponius is sent with him to be their governor; and because he was one of the first instances (it may be the very first instance) of a *procurator Cæsaris*, to whom was committed *merum imperium*<sup>e</sup>, Josephus expressly tells us, that the power he received from Cæsar reached even to the taking away of life<sup>f</sup>.

I have already observed to you that the governors of provinces were judges in all cases of sedition and treason against the Roman state, and in this respect had power over the freest countries, even such as Massilia and Nemausus. This power therefore we may be sure was in the procurator of Judæa; and it is very probable his power extended to the punishment of all public crimes. It is possible also there might lie an appeal to him from the Jewish courts, or he might have an authority given him to call whatever causes he pleased before himself<sup>g</sup>. These things are uncertain to us now, because we have no account left of the settlement made by Quirinus. I have fully proved to you that the Romans

<sup>e</sup> Probably also the first instance of a governor, under another that was governor of the province, who had the power of the sword. For Judæa was annexed to the province of Syria, and the procurator of Judæa was under the command of the governor of Syria.

<sup>f</sup> Μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐξουσίαν. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 8. §. 1, pr.

<sup>g</sup> Thus much seems implied in that expression of Josephus before quoted, Ἡγησόμενος Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσίᾳ. Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 1.

did not every where make the same settlements ; that in some places the laws of the country were more fully observed, in other places there was a greater mixture of the Roman laws ; in some countries the Roman governor had a greater, in some a less power. What the precise bounds were in Judæa we are altogether ignorant. But that Augustus did grant to the Jews the use of their own laws, and that this was continued to them by the succeeding emperors, is fully evident from many passages in Josephus.

#### SECT. IX.

*Passages from Josephus and Philo, proving that the Romans did grant to the Jews the execution of their own laws even in capital cases.*

THE high priest Ananus, in the speech he makes to the people to stir them up against the zealots, has this expression : “ For if we must suit words to “ things, one shall perchance find that the Romans “ have been the establishers and confirmers of our “ laws, and that our enemies are those within<sup>h</sup>.” With what propriety could the Romans be called the establishers or the confirmers of the Jewish laws, if they took from them the execution ? Every one knows, that, unless penalties are executed, laws are useless. Could those who rendered them useless, who indeed destroyed them, be fitly and properly called βεβαιωτὰς, the confirmers or establishers of them ? And it is well worth the remarking, that Ananus was at this time afraid of speaking in commendation of the Romans ; that what he says is ut-

<sup>h</sup> Καὶ γὰρ ἂν εἰ ἐταίρους δεῖ τοῖς πράγμασι τὰς κλήσεις ἐφαρμόζειν, τάχα ἂν εὖροι τις Ῥωμαίους μὲν ἡμῖν βεβαιωτὰς τῶν νόμων, πολεμίους δὲ τοὺς ἔνδον. Bell. Jud. l. 6. c. 6. §. 2. p. 1173. l. 32.



tered with the utmost caution; and that he durst not have said it, had it not been an acknowledged truth.

Titus, in the speech he makes to the two tyrants, Simon and John, after the temple was burnt, and great part of the city taken, laying before them the great kindness of the Romans to the Jewish nation, says<sup>i</sup>, “First, we gave you the country to possess, “and set over you kings of your own people. Afterwards” (plainly referring to the time we are speaking of, when Augustus sent a Roman governor among them, afterwards) “we preserved to you “your own country laws, and permitted you to “live, not only with regard to yourselves, but with “regard to others also, as you would<sup>k</sup>.”

<sup>i</sup> Τοιγαροῦν ὑμᾶς ἐπήγειρε κατὰ Ῥωμαίων ἢ Ῥωμαίων φιλανθρωπία· οἱ πρῶτον μὲν ὑμῖν τὴν τε χώραν ἔδομεν νέμεσθαι, καὶ βασιλεῖς ὁμοφύλους ἐπέστησαμεν, ἔπειτα τοὺς πατρίους νόμους ἐτηρήσαμεν, καὶ ζῆν οὐ μόνον καθ' ἑαυτοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπετρέψαμεν ὡς ἐβούλεσθε· τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, δασμολογεῖν τε ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἀναθήματα συλλέγειν ἐπετρέψαμεν, καὶ τοὺς ταῦτα φέροντας οὔτε ἐνουθετήσαμεν, οὔτε ἐκωλύσαμεν, ἵν' ἡμῶν γένησθε πλουσιώτεροι πολέμιοι, καὶ παρασκευάσῃσθε τοῖς ἡμετέροις χρήμασι καθ' ἡμῶν. De Bell. Jud. l. 6. c. 6. §. 2. p. 1284, fin.

<sup>k</sup> The Jews, by the distinction of meats and drinks, and other rites, were a people wholly differing from the rest of the world; and no doubt this clause has a reference to all the condescensions and compliances which the Romans made to them upon the account of their singular customs; such as Pilate's going out to them, because they were afraid of being defiled by entering into a heathen's house, his sending away the military ensigns with the images of Cæsar upon them from Jerusalem to Cæsarea, and all the governors before him entering Jerusalem with ensigns that had no images on them, Antiq. l. 18. c. 4. §. 1. and his removing the bucklers without images to Cæsarea, Phil. Leg. ad Caium, p. 1034, B. But doubtless it refers chiefly to the power the Romans gave them to execute their laws upon others. For it is observable, that this part of Titus's speech, in setting forth the

This last clause shews that they suffered the Jewish laws to take effect, not upon Jews only, but also upon foreigners ; and is explained by Titus himself in another speech : “ Did not ye,” says he to the tyrant John, and those that were with him, “ Did not ye Jews set up these bars to fence off the “ holy place ? Have ye not erected pillars herein at “ certain distances, engraven with Grecian and our “ letters, which enjoin that no man should pass these “ bounds ? And have not we permitted you to put “ to death those who go beyond, even though it “ were a Roman<sup>1</sup> ?” There were several cases in which the Jewish laws reached the lives of foreigners who dwelt among them, which the Romans could not think merited death ; such as idolatry, blasphemy, passing beyond the court of the Gentiles into that of the Jews in the temple, and some others. Notwithstanding, even in these cases, as it

kindness of the Romans to the Jewish nation, rises from the beginning to the end. They did not take away the country from them, as they might have done by right of conquest, but left them the free possession of it, and placed kings of their own country over them. Afterwards, when they requested to be no longer under kings, thinking they might have a more free use of their own laws under a Roman governor, the Romans preserved to them the free use of their own laws, and permitted them to live not only among themselves, but with others also, as they would, i. e. that their customs and laws should take place, not only with Jews, but with foreigners also ; that they should either yield to them, or be punished by them. Nay, what is yet more, suffered them to collect a holy tribute and offerings from all parts of the empire, and send it to Jerusalem without molestation, which in the event proved the enriching their enemies, and arming them against themselves with their own money.

<sup>1</sup> Οὐχ ἡμεῖς δὲ τοὺς ὑπερβάντας ὑμῶν ἀναιρεῖν ἐπετρέψαμεν, καὶ Ῥωμαῖός τις ᾗ. De Bell. Jud. l. 6, c. 2. §. 4. p. 1269, pr.

appears to me from the latter clause of the first of these speeches of Titus, the Romans indulged them in the execution of their own laws. In the last-mentioned case he expressly tells us they did, and that even though the person who transgressed were a Roman. I have before observed to you, that the freest countries had not power given them over Romans: that the Rhodians, Lycians, and Cyzicenians lost their liberties by putting Romans to death. Herein then was a peculiar privilege granted to the Jews above all other free people, that they were permitted in some cases to take away even the lives of Romans themselves. How much more then had they this power over other foreigners? And if they were allowed to execute their laws upon foreigners in capital cases, can any one doubt that they were suffered to execute them upon their own people? Philo tells us certain death was decreed against those Jews who went beyond the bounds prescribed them in the temple<sup>m</sup>. And king Agrippa, in the letter he writes to the emperor Caius, informing him that the high priest entered once a year into the holy of holies, on the day called the fast only, adds, “And if at any time any one, I say, not of the  
“other Jews, but even of the priests, not of the  
“lowest of them, but of those who have obtained  
“the order immediately next to the high priest,  
“should enter either by himself or with the high  
“priest; and, what is more, if the high priest him-  
“self should go in two days in the year, or even

<sup>m</sup> Περιττότερα δὲ καὶ ἐξαίρετός ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἅπασιν ἢ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν σπουδή. Τεκμήριον δὲ μέγιστον, θάνατος ἀπαραίτητος ὥρισται κατὰ τῶν εἰς τοὺς ἐντὸς περιβόλους παρελθόντων. Δέχονται γὰρ εἰς τοὺς ἐξωτέρω τοὺς πανταχόθεν πάντας τῶν ὁμοεθνῶν. Leg. ad Caium, p. 1022, fin.

“ thrice or four times on the fast-day, he suffers death inevitable<sup>n</sup>.”

Titus, in the place before quoted, affirms, “ We have preserved to you your own country laws.” Are not the penalties enjoined one necessary part of the laws? Are they not, indeed, that which animates and gives life to them? If then the Romans allowed not the Jews to execute the punishments threatened, with what truth could it be said that they preserved to them their laws? Josephus asserts the same thing, in a speech he makes to the besieged, declaring, that even to that time their laws had been the care of the Romans<sup>o</sup>. And in another speech, which he makes to them by the command of Titus, tells them, “ The Romans demand the accustomed duty which our fathers paid to their fathers; and, obtaining this, they will neither waste the city nor touch the sacred things. They grant you that your children, wives, and parents<sup>p</sup> should be free, and that you should possess your own estates, and they preserve your sacred laws<sup>q</sup>.”

<sup>n</sup> Κἄν ἄρα τίς που, οὐ λέγω τῶν ἄλλων Ἰουδαίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἱερέων, οὐχὶ τῶν ἰστάτων, ἀλλὰ τῶν τὴν εὐθὺς μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον τάξιν εἰληχότων, ἣ καθ’ αὐτὸν ἢ μετ’ ἐκείνου συνεισέλθῃ, μᾶλλον δὲ κἄν αὐτὸς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς δυσὶν ἡμέραις τοῦ ἔτους, ἢ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ τρίς, ἢ καὶ τετράκις εἰσφοιτήσῃ, θάνατον ἀπαραίτητον ὑπομένει. Leg. ad Caium, p. 1035, pr.

<sup>o</sup> Οἱ μέχρι νῦν κήδονται τῶν ἡμετέρων νόμων. De Bell. Jud. l. 6. c. 2. §. 1. p. 1267. l. 19.

<sup>p</sup> Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ τὸν συνήθη δασμὸν αἰτοῦσιν, ὃν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τοῖς ἐκείνων πατράσι παρέσχον. καὶ τούτου τυχόντες, οὔτε πορθοῦσι τὴν πόλιν, οὔτε ψαύουσι τῶν ἁγίων. διδῶσι δ’ ὑμῖν τᾶλλα γενεάς τε ἐλευθέραις, καὶ κτήσεις τὰς ἐαυτῶν νέμεσθαι, καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς νόμους σώζουσι. De Bell. Jud. l. 5. c. 9. §. 4. p. 1243. l. 36.

<sup>q</sup> So I think Josephus himself explains the word γενεάς in this very speech, p. 1244. l. 33. Γενεάς γοῦν ὑμετέρας οἰκτεῖρατε, καὶ πρὸ

And Titus himself professes before God, “that he  
 “ had offered them peace, and the use of their own  
 “ laws<sup>r</sup>.” To what purpose is all this said, and what  
 good effect could it possibly be supposed to have  
 upon the besieged Jews, if they knew at the same  
 time that the Romans did not allow them that  
 which is the spirit and energy of all laws, viz. the  
 execution of them? Would not this appear to them  
 a downright mockery? a putting them in mind of  
 the servitude they had hitherto been under to the  
 Romans, who, although they openly professed to al-  
 low them the use of their own laws, deprived them  
 of that which is absolutely necessary to their execu-  
 tion, i. e. inflicting the penalties annexed to them?

## SECT. X.

### *Objections answered.*

IT may possibly be objected, that Judas the Ga-  
 lilæan complained that the Jews were deprived of  
 their liberty when Augustus sent Quirinus to annex  
 Judæa to the province of Syria, and enrol their

ἄφθαιμῶν ἐκάστῳ γενέσθω τέκνα, καὶ γυνή, καὶ γονεῖς, οὓς ἀναλώσει κατὰ  
 μικρὸν ἢ λιμὸς, ἢ πόλεμος.

<sup>r</sup> Καῖσαρ δ' ἀπελογεῖτο, καὶ περὶ τούτου τῷ Θεῷ, φάσκων, παρὰ μὲν  
 αὐτοῦ Ἰουδαίοις εἰρήνην καὶ αὐτονομίαν προτείνεσθαι, καὶ πάντων ἀμνηστίαν  
 τῶν τετολμημένων. De Bell. Jud. l. 6. c. 3. §. 5. This passage alone  
 is little short of a demonstration that the Jews did obtain of Au-  
 gustus the αὐτονομία, or free use of their own laws, which they  
 petitioned for. Titus, in apologizing for himself to the God of  
 the Jews for having reduced them to so great an extremity that a  
 woman eat her own son, declares that he offered them peace and  
 αὐτονομίαν, as well as an amnesty of all that was past. Is it to be  
 imagined, that when he had subdued their country, and laid such  
 close siege to Jerusalem, he would grant them better terms than  
 they enjoyed before their revolt?



estates<sup>s</sup>. But what liberty did Judas mean? the liberty of executing their own laws? No, but an enthusiastic liberty of calling no man master, acknowledging no other ruler than God, and paying no taxes<sup>t</sup>. Josephus expressly calls this man's opinion madness<sup>u</sup>, and a change of their ancient laws and institutions<sup>x</sup>; and informs us, that it was the beginning of a new sect among the Jews, the prevalency of which sect at length ended in the destruction of their city and temple<sup>y</sup>. Some of the Jews, who gave too much ear to the doctrine taught by this man, and his companion Sadoc the Pharisee, and others, who knew not what a Roman census or enrolment was, were at first uneasy; but, being per-

<sup>s</sup> Ἡπείγετο ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει, τὴν τε ἀποτίμησιν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ἄντικρυς δουλείαν ἐπιφέρειν λέγοντες, καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐπ' ἀντιλήψει παρακαλοῦντες τὸ ἔθνος. Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 1. p. 792. l. 5.

<sup>t</sup> Μόνον ἡγεμόνα καὶ δεσπότην τὸν Θεὸν ὑπειληφόσι, θανάτων τε ἰδέας ὑπομένειν παρήλλαγμένας ἐν ὀλίγῳ τίθενται, καὶ συγγενῶν τιμωρίας καὶ φίλων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδένα ἄνθρωπον προσαγορεύειν δεσπότην. Ibid. §. 6. p. 794. l. 6. Ἰουδας——εἰς ἀπόστασιν ἐνήγε τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους, κακίζων, εἰ φόρον τε Ῥωμαίοις τελεῖν ὑπομένουσι, καὶ μετὰ τὸν Θεὸν οἴουσι θηγετοὺς δεσπότας. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 8. §. 1.

<sup>u</sup> Ἀνοίκα τε τῇ ἐντεῦθεν ἤρξατο νοσεῖν τὸ ἔθνος. Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 6. p. 794. l. 14.

<sup>x</sup> Οὕτως ἄρα ἡ τῶν πατρῶν κίνησις καὶ μεταβολὴ μεγάλας ἔχει ῥοπὰς τοῦ ἀπολουμένου τοῖς συνελθοῦσιν. Ibid. §. 1. p. 792. l. 30.

<sup>y</sup> Ἦν δὲ οὗτος, σοφιστὴς ἰδίας αἰρέσεως, οὐδὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις προσεοικώς. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 8. §. 1. Εἴ γε καὶ Ἰουδας καὶ Σάδδουκος τετάρτην φιλοσοφίαν ἐπέισακτον ἡμῖν ἐγείραντες, καὶ ταύτης ἐραστῶν εὐπορηθέντες, πρὸς τε τὸ παρὸν θορύβαν τὴν πολιτείαν ἐνέπλησαν, καὶ τῶν αὔθις κακῶν κατειληφόντων ρίζας ἐφυτεύσαντο τῷ ἀσυνήθει πρότερον φιλοσοφίας τοιαύτῃ. Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 1. p. 792. l. 32. Vid. et l. 15—30. Μέχρι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνείματο πυρὶ τῶν πολεμίων ἦδε ἡ στάσις, l. 29. Ληστηρίων δὲ μεγάλων ἐπιθέσει καὶ διαφθοραῖς ἀνδρῶν τῶν πρώτων, l. 20. The Latrones and Sicarii were of this sect. Vid. de Bell. Jud. l. 7. c. 8. §. 1, 2. et c. 10. §. 1.



suaded by Joazar the high priest, they came into it without further hesitation<sup>z</sup>.

It is further objected, that although the Jews were allowed the liberty of their own laws, yet the execution of them was in the hands of the Romans; that the Roman governor sat as judge, and by the advice of assessors, skilled in the Jewish laws, gave sentence<sup>a</sup>.

In answer to this, it is fully evident from what has been already said, that where the Romans allowed a people the liberty of their own laws, they also allowed them their own magistrates. Thus was it not only in the freest places, such as Nemausus and Massilia, but where the liberty granted was more restrained, as in Asia and Sicily, which appears from the express words of Tully, that have been already quoted<sup>b</sup>. That thus also it was in Ju-

<sup>z</sup> Judas stirred up the Jews to rebellion, telling them that the Roman census would bring nothing less than plain servitude upon them; and had he gone no further than this, his sentiments were exactly the same with those of the senate themselves, which we have before quoted from Livy. Οἱ δὲ, καίπερ τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς ἐν δεινῷ φέροντες τὴν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀπογραφαῖς ἀκρόασιν, ὑποκατέβησαν τοῦ εἰς πλέον ἐναντιοῦσθαι, πείσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως Ἰωαζάρου.—καὶ οἱ μὲν, ἡττηθέντες τοῦ Ἰωαζάρου τῶν λόγων, ἀπετίμων χρήματα, μὴδὲν ἐνδοιάσαντες, Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 1. p. 791, fin.

<sup>a</sup> Huber. Diss. l. 1. c. 5. §. 7. p. 29, 30. Lardn. Cred. vol. 1. p. 152, fin.

<sup>b</sup> Quod civis Romanus a Siculo petit, Siculo judex datur, &c. in *Ver.* l. 2. §. 13. Sibi libertatem Græci censent datam, ut Græci inter se disceptent suis legibus. *Ad Attic.* l. 6. ep. 1. p. 909. a. fin. Græci exultant quod peregrinis judicibus utuntur, p. 909. b. pr. Omnes suis legibus et judiciis usæ αὐτονομίαν adeptæ revixerunt. *Ibid.* ep. 2. p. 911. a. med. I think it is evident from these last words of Tully, that unless they had the administration of the laws in their own hands, i. e. had their own judges as well as

dæa, even in capital cases, Pilate himself is witness. He says to the Jewish magistrates in the case of our

their own laws, the Greeks did not esteem it to be *αὐτονομία*. And I doubt not but the same may be made fully to appear from the use of the word in Greek authors. Nothing is more certain than that the possessing *αὐτονομία* is of the same import as *νόμοις χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἰδίοις*. But how can a people be said to have the use of their own laws that have not the administration of them in their own hands? If others administer them, it is possible, indeed, the people may have the benefit of them, but they cannot be said to have the use of them; it is others that use them in their behalf. When Polybius says, *Ἀπέδωκαν δὲ καὶ Φωκαιεῦσι τὸ πάτριον πολίτευμα*, Livy expresses it thus, *Et ut legibus antiquis uterentur, permissum*. No one will dispute that the Greek of Polybius implies the administration of their laws. Livy judges it to be equivalent to say, the use of their laws. Vid. Excerpt. Leg. 36. p. 844. fin. et Liv. l. 38. c. 39. It is also certain that the words *ἐλευθερία* and *αὐτονομία* are promiscuously used by Greek authors as signifying one and the same thing. Thus Diodorus Siculus, what he calls *αὐτονομίαν*, p. 296, A. he calls *ἐλευθερίαν*, p. 297, pr. And it is certain that he meant hereby that the Sardinians had their own magistrates as well as their own laws. And Josephus, when he tells us that the Jews petitioned that their country might be annexed to the province of Syria, because they earnestly desired *αὐτονομίαν*, expresses it in one place by the word *ἐλευθερία*, *μάλιστα μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦντες ἐλευθερίας, καὶ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγῶν τετάχθαι*. Antiq. l. 17. c. 9. §. 4. prop. fin. One article of the peace after the second Punic war was, according to Polybius, that the Carthaginians *ἔθεσι καὶ νόμοις χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἰδίοις*. This in Livy is expressed thus: *Ut liberi legibus suis viverent*. Vid. Polyb. l. 15. p. 705. Liv. l. 30. c. 37. That the Romans granted the privilege of having their own magistrates to all those places to which they granted *ἐλευθερία*, or to be free states, is fully evident from the words of Tully before quoted: *Omitto jurisdictionem in liberam civitatem, contra leges senatusque consulta*. In *Pison*. And when it is said in the places above cited that liberty was taken away from the Lycians, Rhodians, and Cyziceniens, because they had imprisoned and put to death Roman citizens, did not this liberty consist in having their own magistrates as well as their own laws? Why were the an-

Saviour, *Take ye him, and judge him according to your law*<sup>c</sup>. And afterwards, the Jews not being able to prove the sedition and treason of which they had accused him, to the satisfaction of Pilate, he says, *Take ye him, and crucify him: for I find no fault in him*<sup>d</sup>. I, having heard the cause, cannot perceive that he has committed any crime worthy of death. If he be an offender against your law, take him and punish him yourselves, as you think he deserves.

There was so great a difference between the Roman and Jewish laws, that Tacitus avers they were just contrary the one to the other<sup>e</sup>. And it is very certain that many things were by the Jewish laws made capital crimes, which were by the Romans esteemed most innocent; such in particular as sabbath-breaking, enticing to idolatry, worshipping the host of heaven, the having a familiar spirit, or being a wizard, and blasphemy<sup>f</sup>. And there were other things punished with death by the Jews, which, although not reckoned innocent, yet met with a more favourable treatment among the Romans; such as

cient municipia said to be more free than the colonies, (vid. Aul. Gell. l. 16. c. 13.) but because they had their own magistrates and their own laws? How otherwise could they have been republics distinct and separate from the Roman people? Vid. Fest. in voc. *municipes*.

<sup>c</sup> John xviii. 31.

<sup>d</sup> John xix. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Moses, quo sibi in posterum gentem firmaret, novos ritus contrariosque cæteris mortalibus tradidit. Profana illic omnia, quæ apud nos sacra; rursus concessa apud illos, quæ nobis in-cesta. *Hist.* l. 5. n. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Numb. xv. 35. Deut. xiii. 5—9. xvii. 2—5. Levit. xx. 27. xxiv. 16. Misna, tit. Sanhed. c. 7. Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 13. §. 4. p. 1501.

incest, adultery, sodomy, &c.<sup>g</sup> Is it in the least probable that a Roman governor would put such laws as these in execution, so directly contradictory to his own sentiments of things? When the Jews told Pilate, that by their law Jesus ought to be put to death, *because he made himself the Son of God*<sup>h</sup>, we find that it made not the least impression on him to the disadvantage of our Saviour. He was far from thinking this a crime deserving of death. When therefore he was prevailed with, against his own conscience, to execute him, it was not for any offence against the Jewish law, but for the pretended crime of sedition and treason against the Roman state. In like manner, when a Roman soldier had torn the sacred books, adding blasphemy and scoffs to what he was doing, Cumanus the governor would fain have screened him from the punishment denounced against such in the law of Moses, not judging it a crime that merited death<sup>i</sup>. These instances sufficiently confirm the foregoing reasoning, and make it fully evident, that had the execution of the Jewish laws been left to the Roman governor, the punishments denounced would in many, I think I may say most cases, have been wholly omitted, or very much lessened.

The instance last mentioned may possibly be thought by some<sup>k</sup> a proof that the Jews had not

<sup>g</sup> Levit. xx. 10—16. Deut. xxii. 13—21. Seld. de Syned. p. 1501. l. 38. §. 2, 3. ff. ad Leg. Jul. de Adult. Voet. in Pand. l. 48. tit. 5. n. 20. Vinn. in Instit. de pub. Judic. §. 4. n. 2. Pauli Sent. l. 2. tit. 26. §. 12—15. cum notis; et l. 5. §. 4. n. 10. in Scult. Jurisp. vetus.

<sup>h</sup> John xix. 7.

<sup>i</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 20. c. 4. §. 4.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Lard. Cred. vol. 1. p. 159.

the power of inflicting death. It may be said, that even in the case of blasphemy itself they were forced to apply to the Roman governor for justice against the offender, and could not execute it themselves.

We know the Jews were indulged the peculiar privilege of putting even Romans to death, if they went into the temple beyond the court of the Gentiles; and should we suppose they were permitted to do the same in case of blasphemy<sup>l</sup>, and all other transgressions of the Mosaic law, to which was annexed that severe penalty<sup>m</sup>, the case before us does not in the least contradict that supposition. For the offender was a soldier<sup>n</sup> upon duty, sent on purpose to plunder the town, where the sacred books were taken by him. How was it possible for the Jewish magistrates to apprehend him? How was it possible to obtain justice any otherwise than by the permission of the Roman governor, who was general of the forces, and had employed him among the rest in this expedition? The reasons that are given as prevailing with the governor to comply with the request of the Jews herein, and put the soldier to death, evince that it was not done out of regard to

<sup>l</sup> Levit. xxiv. 16.

<sup>m</sup> Such as idolatry, incest, and the eating any part of a beast while it is yet living. Gemarah. Sanh. c. 7. §. 5. in excerptis Coccei. Maimon. de Regibus, et rerum earum bellicis, c. 10. published by Dr. Prideaux under the title of *De Jure Pauperis et Peregrini*, p. 144, &c.

<sup>n</sup> The offender, being a soldier, probably was a Roman citizen. We know that other, even the freest nations, were not permitted to punish Roman citizens. Whether it were granted to the Jews to do it in all cases wherein their laws reached foreigners, or whether they were allowed it in the single case only mentioned by Titus, we are wholly uncertain.

their laws, and in order to put them in execution ; far from it. Had he not been afraid of a general insurrection of the Jewish nation, the soldier had remained unhurt, and the law against blasphemy wholly neglected<sup>o</sup>.

It is very remarkable how earnest the Jews were to have this man punished. Josephus says they were struck at the news of what the soldier had done, as if the whole country had been set on fire ; that they flocked together to Cæsarea, where Cumanus the governor then was, as though called together by the sound of an instrument, or the voice of the common crier<sup>p</sup> ; that they declared to him they could not bear to live while their country laws were so basely treated<sup>q</sup>. Can it be thought that a people so zealous for the honour of their laws would have sat still, if the execution of them in all capital cases had been wholly taken from their own magistrates, and placed in foreigners, who, they could not but know, from their education under laws so contradictory to the Jewish, would be very remiss and negligent in punishing such who transgressed them ?

<sup>o</sup> Ὁ Κούμανος, δέισας μὴ πάλιν νεωτερίσειε τὸ πλῆθος, συμβουλευσάντων καὶ τῶν φίλων, τὸν ἐνυβρίσαντα τοῖς νόμοις στρατιώτην πελεκίσας ἔπαυσε τὴν στᾶσιν ἐκ δευτέρου μέλλουσαν ἐξάπτεσθαι. *Antiq.* l. 20. c. 4. §. 4, fin.

<sup>p</sup> Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ, ὡς ὅλης αὐτοῖς τῆς χώρας καταφλεγείσης, συνεχύθησαν, καὶ καθάπερ ὄργανον τινὲ τῇ δεισιδαιμονίᾳ συνελκόμενοι, εἰς ἓν κήρυγμα πάντες εἰς Καισάρειαν ἐπὶ Κούμανον συνέδραμον. *De Bell. Jud.* l. 2. c. 12. §. 2. l. 38. I suppose Josephus means by κήρυγμα nothing more than the news of what had happened, which, at the very first hearing, drew the people together to Cæsarea, as though it had been the voice of a common crier.

<sup>q</sup> Ζῆν γὰρ οὐχ ὑπομένειν τῶν πατρίων αὐτοῖς οὕτω περιῦρισμένων. *Antiq.* l. 20. c. 4. §. 4.



## SECT. XI.

*Other passages from Josephus, proving that the Jewish magistrates had the power of putting persons to death in the execution of their own laws.*

THERE is in the History of Josephus a plain and undeniable instance of the Jewish magistrates convening persons before them, sentencing them to death, and putting that sentence in execution. But, because there are exceptions made to it, from some of the circumstances attending it, I will lay the whole passage before the reader, that he may be the better able to form a judgment on what is said.

“ The younger Ananus, who was made high  
“ priest, was exceeding bold and daring. He was  
“ of the sect of the Sadducees, who are cruel above  
“ all the Jews in matters of judicature. Ananus,  
“ being such a sort of a person, and thinking he had  
“ a convenient opportunity, because Festus was dead,  
“ and Albinus was yet on the road, summons a coun-  
“ cil, or court of judges, and bringing before them  
“ (the brother of Jesus who is called Christ, his name  
“ was) James, and some others, he accused them as  
“ transgressors of the law, and delivered them to be  
“ stoned. But such in the city who were esteemed  
“ the most moderate and equitable, who best under-  
“ stood the laws, and were most punctual in observ-  
“ ing them, were displeased at this, and sent pri-  
“ vately to king Agrippa, desiring him to write to  
“ Ananus, that he would no more do such things as  
“ these; for that he had not done this first thing  
“ rightly. And some of them met Albinus in his  
“ way from Alexandria, and inform him that it was  
“ not lawful for Ananus to summon a council with-

“out his consent. For this reason Albinus writes “angrily to Ananus, threatening to punish him: “and king Agrippa took from him the high-priest-“hood<sup>r</sup>.” This was Agrippa jun. king of Batanæa, Trachonitis, and several adjacent countries, who had no other authority in Judæa than that it was permitted him by the Roman emperor to confer or take away the high-priesthood as he pleased.

The passage I have now produced is said to be a proof that the Jewish magistrates had not the power of putting persons to death under a Roman governor; because Ananus chose the time of a vacancy, when, the governor being dead, the new one was not yet arrived, as the fittest opportunity to gratify his cruel disposition. He was blamed for what he did by those who were most exact in their knowledge and observance of the laws. It is expressly said he had no authority to act as he did. He was threatened for it by the new governor Albinus, and was actually punished by king Agrippa, who deprived him of his high office<sup>s</sup>.

The truth of these several circumstances I readily acknowledge, but am so far from thinking they prove what they are brought for, that some of them appear plainly to me to evince the contrary. It is said, “Those in Jerusalem who were most moderate, and “who were accurate observers of the laws,” (which words, I take it, are a periphrastical description of the<sup>t</sup> Pharisees,) “were angry at what was done.”

<sup>r</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 1. l. 34.

<sup>s</sup> Lard. Cred. vol. 1. p. 156, 157.

<sup>t</sup> “Ὅσοι δὲ ἐδόκουν ἐπιεικέστατοι τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν εἶναι, καὶ τὰ περὶ τοὺς νόμους ἀκριβεῖς, βαρέως ἤνεγκαν ἐπὶ τούτῳ. Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 1. p. 897. l. 2. “Ἀλλως τε καὶ φύσει πρὸς τὰς κολάσεις, ἐπιεικῶς ἔχουσιν οἱ

Why? Because Ananus had not herein acted *ὀρθῶς*, *rightly*, i. e. according to the Mosaic law. For so they write to king Agrippa, who was a Jew, and well skilled in the Jewish laws and customs<sup>u</sup>. The Christian converts from among the Jews, and more especially those who resided in the land of Judæa, were at this time strict observers of the Mosaic laws<sup>x</sup>. And James, the brother of our Lord, was called *the Just*, most probably because of his remarkable adherence to and punctual observance of those laws<sup>y</sup>. How was it possible to condemn him, and such as he was, to death, without a manifest violation of the law of Moses? This no doubt was one reason which inclined Agrippa to deprive Ananus of the high-priesthood. Ananus chose the opportunity when there was no Roman governor in Judæa as the fittest for his purpose. And why did he esteem it such? Because he knew, that had he stayed till the new governor arrived, all those who were friends of the apostle, and of the others he put to death, together with those who were of a milder and more moderate disposition, would intercede with the governor to stop his proceedings. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, that the Pharisees, by their moderation, more than once delivered the Christians from the more violent counsels of the Sadducees<sup>z</sup>.

It is very remarkable, that the persons who went

Φαρισαῖοι. Ibid. l. 13. c. 10. §. 6. p. 587, prop. fin. Οἱ περὶ τὰ πατρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβεῖα διαφέρειν. Vita, §. 38. p. 923, pr. Vid. et de Bell. Jud. l. 1. c. 5. §. 2. et l. 2. c. 8. §. 14, pr.

<sup>u</sup> Acts xxvi. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Acts xxi. 21—24.

<sup>y</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 2. c. 1. et 23. Gal. ii. 12.

<sup>z</sup> Acts v. 33, 34, &c. and xxiii. 6, 7, &c.

to meet Albinus, the new governor, tell him that Ananus had no authority to summon a council without his leave; plainly intimating, that with his consent he had this power; which thing alone determines the whole dispute. They do not say, as they must have said, had they spoken to the purpose for which this is alleged, "The Jewish magistrates are not permitted to condemn and execute criminals in capital causes;" but, "The high priest is not permitted to call the Jewish magistrates or judges together without the consent of the governor." This probably was one part of the settlement made by Quirinus, that the Jewish sanhedrim should not meet without leave of the Roman governor; and it is not unlikely that every Roman governor, at his first coming into the province, gave a general license to the high priest, and to the prince of the sanhedrim, to summon the court whenever they saw occasion, and this to continue the whole time of his administration, unless he at any time sent a special prohibition.

If the Jewish magistrates had not ordinarily the power to execute capital punishments under the Romans, would it not have been expressly mentioned as an aggravation of the guilt of which Ananus is accused? How could it well have been omitted? Can we think that those persons who were so zealous to meet the new governor in his way from Alexandria, on purpose to inform him how very much contrary to the settlement made by the Romans Ananus had acted, would suppress that which in truth was the greatest breach hereof? Would they have contented themselves with saying that it was not lawful for him to call together the council,

or court of judges, without the governor's consent, and not have added, that it was much more unlawful for them, when met together, to condemn persons to capital punishments, and put their sentence in execution? that even the governor himself could not grant them a power to do this? Certainly they would have added something of this kind, if the Romans had not permitted the Jewish magistrates to execute their own laws ordinarily in capital cases. The reason why Albinus sent an angry and threatening letter to Ananus is, most evidently, because he did not wait for his license. Not that the executing capital punishments was a thing in general forbidden them by the Romans, but that he ought not to have summoned the sanhedrim without the governor's previous consent. This determined Agrippa to take from him the high priesthood: for had he kept in a person who had made such an encroachment on the authority of the Roman governor, and was thereby become obnoxious, he might himself have been in no small danger of losing the privilege he had of conferring the high-priesthood.

Does not Josephus here affirm of the Sadducees, that they *are* cruel above all the Jews in matters of judicature<sup>a</sup>? They had been now, first and last, fifty years under Roman governors<sup>b</sup>. Is it probable he would have used such an expression as this, if they had been all this time deprived of judicial proceedings in causes of life and death? Would he not

<sup>a</sup> Οἵπερ εἰσι περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὡμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους. P. 896.

l. 37.

<sup>b</sup> With the interruption of four years only under the reign of Herod Agrippa.

rather have said, that formerly, when the Jewish magistrates had the execution of their own laws in capital cases, the Sadducees were wont to be the most cruel of all the Jews? Is it not astonishing that he should nowhere through his whole History, upon any occasion, give us the least hint that the Romans had taken from the Jews the power of inflicting death? Had it been really so, one would think it was almost impossible he should have avoided it. At least it is very certain he would not have so written as to lead us to judge they had the actual exercise of this power, as he does in the place before us.

Thus also, when he is giving an account of the sect of the Essenes, he says, “ They are most exact “ and just in their judicial proceedings. Not fewer “ than 100 of them met together sit in judgment, “ and what is determined by them is unchangeable. “ The name of the legislator is, next to God, the “ most honoured by them ; and if any one speaks “ evil of him, he is punished with death <sup>c</sup>.” Here is a plain and full account that one sect of the Jews did judge in capital causes, and inflict death on criminals. And although it is introduced after the relation of Judæa’s being made a province, yet is it not said, Thus the Essenes were wont to do, before they were deprived of this power by the Romans ; but, Thus they do.

On the other hand it is urged, that in all Josephus’s

<sup>c</sup> Περὶ δὲ τὰς κρίσεις ἀκριβέστατοι, καὶ δίκαιοι· καὶ δικάζουσι μὲν οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν ἑκατὸν συνελθόντες. τὸ δὲ ὀρισθὲν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἀκίνητον· σέβας δὲ μέγιστον παρ’ αὐτοῖς μετὰ τὸν Θεὸν, τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ νομοθέτου· καὶ βλασφημίῃ τις εἰς τοῦτον, κολάζεσθαι θανάτῳ. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 8. §. 9, pr.



History of these times, when criminals abounded in Judæa, and many were put to death by the Roman governors, we find not the mention of any one put to death by the Jewish council or magistracy, except those which were stoned in a vacancy between the death of Festus (which happened in the province) and the arrival of Albinus his successor <sup>d</sup>.

That we have not an account of many criminals being put to death by the Jewish magistrates, in the History of Josephus, is not at all surprising; it being beneath the dignity of an historian to descend so low as the execution of ordinary criminals. He would, in all probability, have omitted the relation of the death of James, our Lord's brother, had it not occasioned to Ananus the loss of the high-priesthood, and been esteemed by the skilful a proceeding contrary to the Jewish laws. When, indeed, crimes are of such a nature as to create immediate danger to the safety of the state, it is incumbent on an historian to take notice of them; and I can venture to affirm, upon a strict examination, that of this sort are all those crimes for which persons are said to be put to death by the Roman governors in the History of Josephus. There is no one instance in that History of any criminal's being put to death under the four first Roman governors, and of very few under their successors, till the Jews became greatly seditious, and ripe for that rebellion which issued in the destruction of their temple and city. The persons said to be executed by the Roman governors were generally such who had been in arms, and com-

<sup>d</sup> Lard. Cred. vol. 1. p. 154.

mitted great disorders. Nor can I find that any one was put to death by them as a criminal, who either had not appeared in arms, or been judged guilty of sedition and treason against the Roman state, unless it were the soldier who tore the sacred books, of which I have taken notice before <sup>e</sup>.

<sup>e</sup> Although the objector asserts that criminals abounded in Judæa during the time it was a Roman province, and that Josephus mentions many who were put to death by the Roman governors; yet upon examination I cannot find that he gives an account of the execution of any one person, excepting our Saviour, till very near the close of Pilate's government, i. e. till near thirty years after Judæa was added to the province of Syria. The Samaritans had many of them taken arms, and assembled at a certain place called Tirathaba. Pilate sent forces against them, which slew some and took others: the chief of those who were taken, Pilate put to death. *Antiq. l. 18. c. 5. §. 1.* About nine years after this (when Judæa was a second time made a province upon the demise of king Agrippa) Cuspius Fadus, the governor, put to death Annibas, the author of an insurrection against the Philadelphenses, in which many persons had lost their lives. Tholomæus, the captain of a band of robbers, who had done very great mischief in Idumæa and to the Arabs, was also punished with death by him. *L. 20. c. 1. §. 1.* The same governor sent a troop of horse after Theudas and his followers, which took Theudas, cut off his head, and brought it to Jerusalem. *Ibid. c. 4. §. 1.* Tiberius Alexander, who succeeded him, commanded James and Simon, the sons of Judas the Galilæan, to be crucified. Josephus does not tell us for what crimes, but, making mention of their father's crime in the same place, no one, I think, can doubt that it was for exciting the people to rebellion by preaching his peculiar doctrines. *Ibid. §. 2.* Some time after this, Ummidius Quadratus, president of Syria, crucified the Jews who had been in arms against the Samaritans, and were defeated and taken by Cumanus. *Ibid. c. 5. §. 1, 2.* Afterwards he sent for eighteen Jews who had been engaged in the same battle, and beheaded them. *De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 12. §. 6.* He at the same time put to death Dortus, and four others, for persuading the people to re-

volt from the Romans. Antiq. l. 20. c. 5. §. 2. Sedition now spread itself through the whole country. Ἐτράποντο δὲ πολλοὶ πρὸς ληστείαν διὰ τὴν ἄδειαν· καὶ κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν ἀρπαγαὶ τε ἦσαν, καὶ τῶν θρασυτέρων ἐπαναστάσεις. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 12. §. 5. l. 35. Felix the governor took daily many impostors and robbers, and put them to death. Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 5. de Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 13. §. 2, fin. et §. 4, 5. The impostors were such who, pretending to shew signs and wonders, drew multitudes after them into the wilderness, in order to raise a rebellion. Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 6, pr. Πλάνοι γὰρ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἀπατεῶνες, προσχήμετι θειασμοῦ, νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ μεταβολὰς πραγματευόμενοι, δαιμονῶν τὸ πλῆθος ἀνέπειθον. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 13. §. 4. The robbers were little armies, which excited the people to rebel, threatening with death those who submitted to the Romans, burning and plundering such houses and villages whose inhabitants refused to come into their measures. Πάλιν δὲ οἱ ληστὰι τὸν ὄμιον εἰς τὸν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμον ἡρέθιζον, μηδὲν ὑπακούειν αὐτοῖς λέγοντες, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀπειθούντων κώμας ἐμπιπράντες διήρπαζον. Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 6, fin. Μεριζόμενοι γὰρ εἰς τὴν χώραν κατὰ λόχους, διήρπαζόν τε τὰς τῶν δυνατῶν οἰκίας, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀνῆρουν, καὶ τὰς κώμας ἐνεπίμπρασαν· ὥς τε τῆς ἀπονοίας αὐτῶν πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἀναπίμπλασθαι. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 13. §. 6. These robbers were of the sect of Judas the Galilæan. Compare the places last quoted with Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 1. l. 16, &c. Ληστηρίων δὲ μεγάλων ἐπιθέσεσι καὶ διαφθοραῖς ἀνδρῶν τῶν πρώτων. L. 20. Ἀνοίξ᾽ τε τῇ ἐντεῦθεν ἤρξατο νοσεῖν τὸ ἔθνος. Ibid. §. 6, fin. The Sicarii were also of the same sect. De Bell. Jud. l. 7. c. 8. §. 1. et c. 10. §. 1. Under Festus this people increased. He took many of them, and put them to death. Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 10. et de Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 14. §. 1, pr. Under Albinus they increased yet more; for those of them who were taken and in prison he dismissed for money. He also took money of and encouraged the seditious, and was himself ὥσπερ ἀρχιληστής. Ibid. At his leaving the province he made a general gaol-delivery, putting to death some who were most obnoxious, and taking money for the release of all the rest; so that the country was filled with robbers. Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 5. Gessius Florus, who succeeded him, gave license to all to commit robberies as they pleased, so they brought him part of the plunder. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 14. §. 2. Antiq. l. 20. c. 10. §. 1. He crucified Jews who were Roman knights. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 14. §. ult. fin. It is not said what was their crime,

## SECT. XII.

*Passages from the Talmud, proving that the Jewish magistrates had the execution of their own laws in capital cases under the Romans; and the Talmudical account very consistent with the History of Josephus.*

THERE is an instance also in the Talmud, of a priest's daughter who was burnt for playing the harlot; which, according to the best calculation that can be made, must have fallen out under the Roman governors<sup>f</sup>. And it is expressly said in the Gemara, that the four capital punishments inflicted by the Jewish council or magistracy were in use during the forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem<sup>g</sup>. And I cannot but think, if we will allow of the explication of the learned Selden, that the Talmudical expression mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, when compared, will be found very exactly to agree with the History of Josephus. According to Selden the Talmudists say, "That capital judgments were" (not wholly taken away from them, as some have understood the expression, but) "greatly interrupted for forty years before the destruction of the temple." Had they been taken away by Judæa's being made a Roman province, they must

most probably the pretence was treason. So great was his cruelty, that it was the immediate occasion of the war which broke out in the second year of his government. Antiq. l. 20. c. ult. §. 1, fin. De Bell. l. 2. c. 14. §. 4, pr.

<sup>f</sup> Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 249.

<sup>g</sup> Quod magis est dicendum de quadraginta illis qui excidium anteverterunt annis, quibus etiam quatuor poenæ capitales in usu. Thosiph ad tit. Abodah zarah, c. 1. fol. 8. 2. quoted by Selden de Syned. l. 2. c. 15. §. 11. p. 1563.

have fixed the date much earlier, and said they had been taken away sixty years before the destruction mentioned. When they say forty years, it is evident the time fixed falls under the government of Pontius Pilate; and agreeably hereto Josephus speaks of him as the first Roman governor who broke through the Jewish laws<sup>h</sup>. And Agrippa in Philo expressly tells us, he was guilty of corruption<sup>i</sup>, the receiving of bribes to pervert justice being the first laid to his charge, among several other the greatest crimes of which a governor can be accused. Of Cuspius Fadus, and Tiberius Alexander, the two first governors sent by the emperor Claudius, Josephus says that they acted nothing contrary to the Jewish customs<sup>k</sup>. Cumanus, who succeeded, took money of the Samaritans to protect those who had murdered the Galilæans<sup>l</sup>. Felix, being reproved by Jonathan the high priest, for his injustice in the administration of the Jewish affairs, employed robbers to murder him, who being countenanced and encouraged by this wicked governor for the service they had herein done him, numberless murders were committed by them afterwards with impunity<sup>m</sup>. Albinus dismissed all malefactors for money, and

<sup>h</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 4. (Hud. 3. Hav.) §. 1, 2.

<sup>i</sup> Τὰς δωροδοκίας, τὰς ὕβρεις, τὰς ἀρπαγάς, τὰς αἰκίας, τὰς ἐπηρείας, τοὺς ἀκρίτους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους φόνους, τὴν ἀνήνυτον καὶ ἀργαλεωτάτην ὁμότητα διεξεληθόντες. Leg. ad Caium, p. 1034, C.

<sup>k</sup> Οἱ, μηδὲν παρακινούντες τῶν πατρίων ἐθῶν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὸ ἔθνος διεφύλαξαν. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 11. §. 6. l. 31.

<sup>l</sup> Ὁ δὲ χρήμασι πεισθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν Σαμαρέων ὀλιγώρησεν. In cod. Busb. Χρήμασι πολλοῖς ἀποτυφλωθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν Σαμαρέων, κἀκείνους μάλλον πεισθεὶς, τὴν ἐκδίκησιν ὀλιγώρησεν. Antiq. l. 20. c. 5. §. 1. l. 24.

<sup>m</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 6. §. 5. p. 893. The corruption of this governor is more than hinted Acts xxiv. 26.

Gessius Florus was sharer with such in their unlawful gains <sup>n</sup>. From this account of Josephus, I think, we may easily see the true reason of the interruption given to the proceedings of the Jewish magistrates in capital causes for forty years before the destruction of the temple. It was owing to the corruption and maladministration of several of the Roman governors who took bribes, or shared the plunder, in order to protect criminals from justice <sup>o</sup>.

The Talmudists, and other Jewish writers, tell us, that the great council sat in a room of the temple called Gazith <sup>p</sup>; that in the trial of capital causes they were obliged to sit in this room, and could condemn no one to death in any other place <sup>q</sup>; that the lesser councils, which had the power of judging in cases of life and death, could not proceed therein, unless the great council sat in the room Gazith <sup>r</sup>. The reason of this is supposed to be, because there lying an appeal from the lesser councils to the greater one, if that, by not sitting in its proper place, was incapable of determining capital causes, the appeal was hereby prevented. And it was not

<sup>n</sup> De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 14. §. 1. et 2, fin.

<sup>o</sup> It was not in Judæa alone that governors sent from Rome, when corrupt and wicked, followed this practice. Verres is accused of the same, Cum prædonum duces accepta pecunia dimiserit. *Cic. in Ver.* l. 1. c. 4. (9, fin.) p. 269, a.

<sup>p</sup> Misna tit. Middoth, cap. 5. Maimon. Halach. Sanhed. c. 14. in Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 15. §. 4. Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 611, 612.

<sup>q</sup> Gloss. ad tit. Aboda zara, c. 1. fol. 8, 1. ad Gemara, ibid. et ad tit. Sanhed. cap. 5. fol. 41. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Maimon. Halach. Sanhed. c. 14. Cotzenzis Præcept. affirm. 102. in Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 15. §. 6. Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 248, fin.



permitted that the lesser councils should sit on capital judgments, unless the great council was in its proper place, and so capable of receiving appeals from them<sup>s</sup>.

It is said in the Talmud, that the great council, or sanhedrim, removed from the room Gazith forty years before the destruction of the temple<sup>t</sup>; and this removing, all judicial proceedings in matters of life and death of course ceased throughout the whole country, I mean among the Jewish magistrates. This removal of the great council is represented by the Talmudists, and all the Jewish writers, as a voluntary thing<sup>u</sup>; not a thing imposed upon them by the authority of the Roman emperors, or enjoined them by the governors; but a matter of their own choice, which for certain reasons they judged expedient. Nor is there the least intimation given that they departed with an intention not to return; on the contrary, it is expressly said, when occasion served, they did return<sup>x</sup>. The reason that is given for this their voluntary removal is the frequency of murders, which they were not able longer to restrain by their judicial sentences<sup>y</sup>. It is very certain, as

<sup>s</sup> Seld. *ibid.* §. 6, fin.

<sup>t</sup> Gemara Bab. a, tit. Sanhed. c. 5. fol. 41. a. et ad tit. Sabbath, c. 1. fol. 15. 1. et ad tit. Aboda zara, c. 1. fol. 8. 2. Cotzenzis Præcept. affirm. 102. in Seld. *ibid.* §. 8.

<sup>u</sup> Gemara Bab. ad tit. Aboda zara cap. 1. fol. 8. 2. Abrah. Zacut. Sepher Juchasin, fol. 21. 1. et fol. 26. 2. in Selden. *Ibid.* §. 10.

<sup>x</sup> שעה צורך Thosiphtha ad tit. Chetuboth. c. 3. fol. 30, 31. et ad tit. Aboda zara, c. 1. fol. 8. 2. et ad Gemara Bab. tit. Sanhed. c. 4. fol. 37. 2. in Seld. *Ibid.* §. 11. Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 613.

<sup>y</sup> Gemara Bab. tit. Aboda zara, c. 1. fol. 8. 2. Abr. Zacut. Sepher Juchasin, fol. 21. 1. in Seld. *Ibid.* c. 10. pr. et fin.

Dr. Lightfoot observes, that by their own account they were far too favourable in their proceedings on capital judgments<sup>z</sup>. And some of the rules they have laid down must have made it not a little difficult to convict a criminal<sup>a</sup>. Notwithstanding, there is but too much reason to think that they were often prevented by the Roman governors<sup>b</sup>,

<sup>z</sup> Vol. 2. p. 248. et 612.

<sup>a</sup> Particularly the premonition required. Maimon. Halach. Sanhed. c. 11, 12. et 18. §. 5, 6, 7. in Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 13. §. 2. I must own it seems not a little incredible. Even Selden himself, in the title of this paragraph says, *Mirandum, de præmonitione actionibus capitalibus, eisque in quibus verberum poenæ usus necessaria; seu de juris aut facti ignorantia præsumpta. Vid. Cocceii Duo Tituli Talmudici, p. 41, pr. et 43, fin.*

<sup>b</sup> Jam vero scimus sub Romanis permissum esse Judæis Hierosolymis synedryum magnum, eique ibi licuisse in loco consueto, seu Liskath Hagazith, judicia etiam capitalia exercere; quod ex supra allatis manifestum est. Cum vero sub annum ante templi excidium quadragesimum, ob sicariorum frequentiam, qui sæpius præsidis favore aliterve tuti, etiam synedrii judicio proculdubio subinde eripiebantur, adeo ut nec homicidia compescere illud posset, nec cædis diutius reos morte plectere, quod quidam ex jure avito atque hactenus sibi relicto (utcunque sic violato) in ejusce munere et officio erat cum synedriis cæteris ferme commune; visum est e loco judiciis hujusmodi adeo proprio ut alibi rite exerceri ab ipsis nequirent, migrare locum in alium, ibique sedes ponere, ubi ex ipsa sessione manifestum redderetur tum homicidas se in jus vocare nolle, quia plane frustra fieret, tum pudere se in locis judiciis capitalibus ita proprio sedes habere, cum tot homines rei capitalis damnandi, ultimoque affiendi supplicio, potestatem suam ac sententiam quotidie eluderent.——Tametsi igitur dominantium libido, et victorum tyrannis in causa erat homicidia sæpe nimis impune intra synedrii jurisdictionem ac imperium committerentur, unde evenit ut migraret illud e loco sibi consueto, alibique intra urbem diu judicia exerceret; id non accipiendum est perinde ac si decreto aliquo seu jussu principali ita pulsum esset, aut judiciorum capitalium potestas ei fuisset erepta, sed

who, for the sake of money, took offenders out of their hands ; it being always in the governor's power to stop their proceedings, and call the cause before himself. And thus the learned Selden understands those words of the Chaldee paraphrast in Psalm lxi. *A wicked king hath made me to remove*. For the paraphrast interprets the Psalm of the removal of the great council, or sanhedrim ; and making the sanhedrim to speak the words of the Psalm, adds at the end of the second verse, *A wicked king or tyrant hath made me to remove*<sup>c</sup> ; i. e. Pilate, the Roman governor, by his stopping the course of justice, and protecting of murderers, hath so increased their number, that it is utterly in vain to attempt to punish them. For which reason the sanhedrim chose rather to leave the place of judgment, than to sit there, and not be able to discharge their duty. They often returned to their place under better governors, or when they had reason to think the governors would not interfere. But from this time robbers and murderers gained such a head, and became so powerful, that they were no more able to do aught against them ; and it is expressly said, that to sit in judgment upon murderers they never did return<sup>d</sup>.

de migratione tantum spontanea, qualem memoravimus. *Seld. de Syned.* l. 2. c. 15. §. 10.

<sup>c</sup> *Seld. de Syn.* l. 2. c. 15. §. 10, med. Vid. et §. 8.

<sup>d</sup> Gloss. ad tit. Chethuboth, fol. 30. 1. in Lightfoot, vol. 2. p.

## SECT. XIII.

*An argument of another nature, rendering it highly probable that the Jewish magistrates under the Romans had the execution of their own laws in capital cases.*

ANOTHER argument, which, I think, has no small weight in it, is this: if all criminal jurisdiction<sup>e</sup>, or if the cognisance only of all capital causes<sup>f</sup>, were in the governor of every province, so that no person could be adjudged to death but by him, what an insupportable addition would this be to the other necessary parts of government? what man could possibly sustain the weight of affairs in any one province? which way could Vitellius in particular have managed the business of Syria, together with that of Judæa annexed to it, when he sent Pilate to give an account of his conduct to Tiberius<sup>g</sup>, the countries of Trachonitis, Gaulonitis, and Batanæa, being at the same time added to the province by the death of Philip the tetrarch<sup>h</sup>? would his whole time have sufficed for the hearing of causes only? It is true he placed his friend Marcellus in the room of Pilate<sup>i</sup>. But if the maxim of the civil law, *Me-*

<sup>e</sup> I have already observed, that according to the arguments of those on the other side of the question, taken from the civil law, all criminal jurisdiction must have been in the governor, and he could delegate no part of it to any other. Vid. sect. 2.

<sup>f</sup> The gentlemen on the other side of the question take it indeed for granted, that all but capital causes might be determined by the Jewish magistrates; but they give no reason for this division of imperium, and according to their principles it is impossible they should.

<sup>g</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 18. c. 4. §. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. c. 5. §. ult.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. c. 4. §. 2.

*rum imperium non posse transire*<sup>k</sup>, that the power of judging and punishing criminals could not be delegated were of force, and took place at this time, Marcellus could lend him no assistance in this part of his office. Vitellius could not confer on him the power of determining criminal causes; yet we very well know there were other pressing affairs, in most provinces not a few, which so engrossed the time of the governors, that they could afford but little, comparatively, for the hearing of ordinary criminals. Vitellius, during the time we have mentioned, marched an army against Aretas king of Arabia<sup>l</sup>, went also to the Euphrates, had an interview with Artabanus king of Parthia, and concluded a peace with him<sup>m</sup>.

If it be said, that after the time of Antoninus Caracalla, when the Roman law was spread through the whole empire, and not only the trial of capital causes, but, what is much more, all criminal jurisdiction, was certainly in the governor of every province, we find not that the business was so great, but many were well able to undergo it; the answer is plain: the provinces were then lessened in proportion to the increase of business, that, which was one province at the time we are speaking of, having been divided into many after the law passed by Antoninus<sup>n</sup>.

<sup>k</sup> L. 1. §. 1. ff. de Offic. ejus cui mand. est Jurisd.

<sup>l</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 18. c. 6. §. 3.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. c. 5. §. 5. Sueton. in Calig. c. 14. §. 5. Dio, l. 59. p. 661. Vid. et Suet. in Vitel. c. 2. §. 7. Lard. Cred. vol. 1. p. 171. 187, 188.

<sup>n</sup> Dio, l. 53. p. 504, A. l. 8, 9, 10. Notit. Imper. apud Panvini-um et Fred. Spanheim. The province of Syria that was under Vitellius, of which we have been speaking, was in Constantine's

## SECT. XIV.

*Arguments taken from the sacred writings to prove the same thing.*

I SHOULD not have given myself the trouble to enter thus deeply into the question before me, had I not been fully persuaded that what I have been maintaining is the real sense of the writers of the New Testament, and that it cannot but appear to any impartial man, who reads the Gospels and the History of the Acts without prejudice, that the most obvious, easy, and natural construction of the several passages relating hereto, is, that the Jewish magistrates had the power of trying capital causes, and inflicting death.

It is well known that the Jewish courts which sat upon life and death were their councils, the great council which sat in the room Gazith at Jerusalem, composed of seventy-one members; and the lesser councils in other cities, composed of twenty-three members<sup>o</sup>. These are often mentioned in the New Testament. The question is, whether they are spoken of in such a manner as implies that they still retained the power of punishing criminals with death, or in such a manner as imports that they had now lost this power?

It cannot be denied, that in the Acts of the Apostles there is one very plain instance of the council's sitting and hearing witnesses, of the prisoner's defence, and of his execution, and that the execution was performed according to the direction of the

time divided into thirteen provinces. Vid. Panvin. Imper. Rom. vol. 2. p. 254. 256.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Seld. de Syned.



law of Moses <sup>p</sup>. The prisoner was stoned, and the hands of the witnesses were first upon him to put him to death <sup>q</sup>. It is the case of the protomartyr Stephen.

To this it is objected, that there is no relation of any sentence pronounced, or of the high priest's collecting the opinions of the court <sup>r</sup>; that after Stephen had uttered these words, *I see the Son of man standing on the right hand of God*, the representation given us by St. Luke has more the appearance of a tumultuous proceeding of the people, than a regular administration of justice <sup>s</sup>.

Were historians to descend minutely to the detail of every particular <sup>t</sup>, who would be at the trouble to read their works? and if it be incumbent on us, in order to prove that a people had the power of executing their own laws in cases which required the inflicting of death, to bring an instance from historians of credit, wherein is related the whole process of the court from beginning to end, I am apt to think it will be difficult, if not impossible, to shew that any one nation in the world, seven or eight hundred years past, had the power of trying capital causes. In relating the trial of the apostle James, and those others who suffered with him, Josephus tells us no

<sup>p</sup> Deut. xvii. 7.

<sup>q</sup> Acts vii. 58.

<sup>r</sup> Lard. Cred. vol. i. p. 107.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. p. 108.

<sup>t</sup> All that is said of Naboth's trial is, *The men of Belial witnessed against him, even against Naboth, in the presence of the people; saying, Naboth did blaspheme God and the king. Then they carried him forth out of the city, and stoned him with stones, that he died.* 1 Kings xxi. 13. Should any one from hence conclude that this was a tumultuous proceeding of the people, he may be convinced of the contrary by turning to the history.

more than that Ananus summoned the council, accused them as transgressors of the law, and delivered them to be stoned. Must we from hence conclude that there were no witnesses heard, no defence made by the prisoners, no debates among the members of the council, no collecting of opinions, no sentence passed? This would be a very hasty proceeding, and most unfair treatment of the historian. It is very seldom he relates even so much as this, when he gives an account of the execution of criminals: must we thence infer that they had no trial, or were brought before no court of judicature? No, such things are passed by, being supposed to be known to every one as things of course. And historians never dwell upon the circumstances of a trial, unless it be to relate something remarkable, and worthy our attention. We should never have known those few circumstances that are related in the trial of St. Stephen, had it not been to introduce that noble speech he made in his defence, and to shew us the temper of the apostle Paul at that time. So the circumstances mentioned in the trial of the apostles in Acts v. are evidently to shew us the courage of the apostles, and to give us the remarkable opinion of Gamaliel in favour of the Christians. But even in this case there is no relation of any sentence passed, only of the execution of the sentence<sup>u</sup>, as in the case of St. Stephen. The circumstances related in the trial of the apostles Peter and John in Acts iv. are to convince us how much they were changed in their temper and behaviour since the resurrection of Christ, and the pouring forth the Holy Spirit;

<sup>u</sup> Acts v. 40.

particularly to set before us the bold and undaunted spirit of the apostle Peter since his recovery after the base denial which he made of his Master. The relation of these circumstances was also necessary to introduce the account which follows of the second effusion of the Holy Ghost on the disciples <sup>x</sup>. And both in this and the two former cases they were highly fitting, in order to make us see the exact fulfilment of several of our Lord's prophecies <sup>y</sup>.

For my own part, I see no more reason to question whether sentence of death was pronounced by the council in the case of St. Stephen, than there is to doubt whether sentence of scourging was pronounced in the case of the apostles, related Acts v., or that of stoning in the case of James, the brother of our Lord, related by Josephus; or that of death in the case of almost any one person he speaks of as executed. Why might not sentence pass while St. Stephen was beholding the heavenly vision? or is it at all improbable that the members of the council should pronounce him guilty of death when they gnashed on him with their teeth, expressing their indignation against him at the same time both by

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Acts iv. 23—31.

<sup>y</sup> Such as those concerning Peter in particular; *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*, Matt. xvi. 18. *I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren*, Luke xxii. 32. And the apostles in general; *Beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils*, Matt. x. 17. *Take heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to the councils*, Mark xiii. 9. *Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer: for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay or resist*, Luke xxi. 14, 15.

their words and actions<sup>z</sup>? After this there appears nothing irregular in the whole proceeding; all is conducted in exact agreement with the Mosaic law. He is cast out of the city<sup>a</sup>, and the witnesses throw the first stone.

But should we allow that there was no sentence passed, and that St. Stephen was executed in a tumultuary manner, through the too great zeal and forwardness of the people, yet is here a plain instance of a prisoner's being brought before the Jewish council, and accused of blasphemy, of their proceeding to hear witnesses, and the defence of the prisoner: to what purpose, if they had no power to put this man to death in case he should be found guilty? Did they meet together with an intent to pass sentence on him, and see that sentence executed, if they found him guilty? or did they not? if they did, the thing contended for is granted; and it is of little import whether sentence were actually passed or not. If they did not meet with this intention, it is very strange it should not be hinted in a case where the person brought before them was actually executed; the more so, because in another case, when the persons brought before them were not executed, St. Luke tells us that it was the intention of the council to have put them to death. Thus is it expressly said, when the apostles stood before them, *that they took counsel to slay them*<sup>b</sup>, and

<sup>z</sup> Acts vii. 54, 55. Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxvi. 66.

<sup>a</sup> Levit. xxiv. 14. Numb. xv. 35, 36. 1 Kings xxi. 13.

<sup>b</sup> Acts v. 33. ἐβουλεύοντο. *They were cut to the heart, and determined to put them to death.* Vid. Grot. in Joan. xii. 10. βουλεύεσθαι non est hic consultare, sed constituere, ut Actor. v. 33. et xv. 37. 2 Cor. i. 17.

without doubt would have executed their design, had not Gamaliel diverted them from it. Is it an argument of no weight, that St. Luke, who gives us this account of their intention in the case of the apostles, and of their actual proceeding in the case of the protomartyr, never once intimates that they herein went beyond their power, and practised that which the Romans did not allow of?

#### SECT. XV.

*Further arguments from the History of the Acts.*

WE have not only this plain and undeniable fact in the one case, and the intention in the other related in the History of the Acts, but we have also a clear and strong assertion that the Jewish magistrates had determined to proceed in the trial of a capital cause made in open court in the presence of the Roman governor himself, who sat there as judge, and this without any check or control from the bench. It is in the speech of Tertullus made to the governor Felix in the case of St. Paul, *whom, says he, we took, and would have judged according to our law*<sup>c</sup>. Is it possible to imagine that any advocate or counsel, be his assurance never so great, could have asserted such a thing as this to the Roman governor himself, if at the same time the Romans had deprived the Jews of capital judgments? That this was a capital cause appears most fully from the accusation<sup>d</sup>; and I dare say no one ever admitted the least doubt of it.

<sup>c</sup> Acts xxiv. 6.

<sup>d</sup> The accusation in the Jewish court no doubt was blasphemy, that *he taught men every where against the people, and the law, and the temple*, Acts xxi. 28. But as it was also in our Saviour's



But should we suppose that the orator could prevail with himself to make such an assertion, can we think that the high priest and elders of the Jewish nation could be so imprudent as to approve of what he said? For it is expressly added, that *they also assented, saying that these things were so*<sup>e</sup>. And if we can imagine that the judge was so favourable to the counsel as to pass by his impertinence without a check, yet sure we cannot possibly believe that he would suffer the high priest and rulers of the nation to confirm such a thing without a rebuke. What! would a Roman governor, sitting in the judgment-seat, hear the Jewish magistrates declare that they would have judged a prisoner in a capital cause, and not sharply reprehend them for it, if at the same time the Romans had absolutely prohibited their proceeding in such causes? What possible construction could be put upon such a declaration, but an open profession of rebellion against the Roman state? Could any governor sit still and hear it with patience? Certainly he could not. Besides, this was not a governor that had his business to

case, when they came before the Roman governor, the crime laid to his charge is sedition: *We have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world*, Acts xxiv. 5. That it was esteemed a capital cause by the Jews, is evident from the outcry they made against him when he had spoken to them from the stairs of the castle; *Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live*. Acts xxii. 22, 23: and from what Festus says to king Agrippa, *Ye see this man, about whom all the multitude of the Jews have dealt with me, both at Jerusalem, and also here, crying that he ought not to live any longer*. Acts xxv. 24.

<sup>e</sup> Acts xxiv. 9.



learn, but one who had presided many years over that nation<sup>f</sup>.

To this it is objected, that it is not easy to say what we ought to understand by these words of Tertullus; that there is little regard to be had to what he says, and that he endeavours to impose upon the governor<sup>g</sup>.

But does not the apostle Paul himself assert the same thing, when, standing before the Jewish council, he says to Ananias the high priest, *Sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law*<sup>h</sup>? If St. Paul had any notion of the end for which he was brought before that court, it was to be tried by the Jewish law. And what is it that Tertullus says more? *whom we took, and would have judged according to our law*. It is true, he adds immediately after, *But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him away out of our hands*<sup>i</sup>. And does not St. Luke tell us much the same, when he says that while St. Paul stood before the council, there arising a great dissension, and the chief captain fearing lest he should be torn to pieces by them, *commanded the soldiers to go down, and to take him by force from among them*<sup>k</sup>. It is very certain this was an imperfect representation of the case; but to what purpose would it have been to have given a more ample detail of the particulars? The Jews took St. Paul. Tertullus passes over in silence all that followed, till he was brought by Lysias before the council. Then the Jews would have

<sup>f</sup> Acts xxiv. 10.

<sup>g</sup> Lard. Cred. vol. 1. p. 129, fin. et 131.

<sup>h</sup> Acts xxiii. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Acts-xxiv. 7.

<sup>k</sup> Acts xxiii. 10.

judged him according to their law. He suppresses the dissension that appeared in court, and only mentions Lysias's taking him away by force. Were the circumstances omitted of any importance to the trying of the cause? Had they been so, the prisoner would no doubt have taken notice of them in his defence, and set them in a clear light. But forasmuch as he has not, and as all these things were plainly subsequent to the facts of which he was accused, and therefore could noways tend to make out either his innocence or guilt, I think we may firmly conclude that Tertullus had no intention to impose on the governor in this part of his oration<sup>1</sup>.

The learned Grotius confines the meaning of Tertullus to one particular crime, and descants upon his words thus: *Whom we would have judged according to our law*, as having brought strangers into the temple, in which crime the execution of capital punishments was permitted by the Romans<sup>m</sup>. For the proof of this last assertion he refers<sup>n</sup> to the words of Titus related in Josephus, which I have already quoted. But those words reach the strangers

<sup>1</sup> It is true, the words upon the first view of them seem as though they related to Lysias's rescuing St. Paul when he was taken in the temple, and like to have been beaten to death by the multitude. It must be acknowledged, the words *came upon us*, might lead us so to think, (though nothing is more usual than to ascribe that to a person which is done by his order.) But as he studied conciseness and brevity in this oration, possibly he did not stand upon the greatest accuracy, any more than Lysias in his letter to Felix; *This man was taken of the Jews, and should have been killed of them; then came I with an army, and rescued him, having understood that he was a Roman.* Vid. Lard. Cred. vol. 1. p. 136.

<sup>m</sup> In loc.

<sup>n</sup> Grot. in Act. xxi. 28. and to Moses de Cotzi, præc. jubent. 21.

themselves only<sup>o</sup>, not the person who should persuade or encourage them to go beyond the bounds prescribed; which, I suppose, is all that can be understood by bringing them into the temple; for it is not to be imagined that force could be used by a single person to make them enter against their wills. The accusation of Tertullus does not say that he so much as prevailed with them to enter; says only that he endeavoured it, ἐπειράσε; we translate it, *hath gone about*, i. e. hath attempted to defile this holy place. That such an attempt, if proved, was death by the Jewish law, I make no doubt: but what ground is there to believe that the Romans indulged them in the execution of this particular law, unless what I am contending for be granted, that they allowed them the use of all their laws in general? Nothing is more certain than that our Saviour was not accused of the crime of bringing strangers into the temple; and yet Pilate the Roman governor says to the Jewish magistrates concerning him, *Take ye him and judge him according to your law*. In this place, therefore, Grotius is forced to give another turn to the words, and interpret them as if he had said, “Take ye him and “punish him with those lesser punishments which “it is permitted you to exercise<sup>p</sup> ;” as though Pilate had been wholly ignorant of what passed in the high priest’s house, or in the council the night before<sup>q</sup>, or did not know that blasphemy was punished

<sup>o</sup> Mr. Lardner also seems to be of this mind. Cred. vol. I. p. 130, fin.

<sup>p</sup> In Joan. xviii. 31.

<sup>q</sup> We cannot reasonably suppose that either the fame of Jesus, or the attempts of the Jewish rulers against him, much less their

with death by the Jewish law, notwithstanding that he had been now governor of this nation some years. Grotius supposes that before Pilate said these words the Jews had accused our Saviour to him of sabbath-breaking, and such-like crimes<sup>r</sup>. But could he be now to learn that sabbath-breaking also was made death by the Jewish law? and does not the answer that they immediately subjoin to Pilate's saying fully evince that if they had accused him of any thing in particular it was of a capital crime? for they reply, *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death*, meaning, this holy season. But whatever be the meaning of those words, they fully shew that they had accused him as a malefactor worthy of death.

#### SECT. XVI.

*Arguments to the same purpose taken from the Gospels.*

I SHALL lay before the reader some things which relate hereto in the four Gospels, and conclude this part of the chapter. Our Lord says to his disciples, *Beware of men; for they will deliver you up to the councils*<sup>s</sup>. *Take heed to yourselves; for they*

proceedings the night before, and early that morning in the high priest's house, and in the council, could be unknown to Pilate. He was watchful enough of all the motions of the Jewish rulers. Remissness and want of vigilance is not among the number of crimes laid to his charge. We cannot therefore, I think, much err in taking it for granted that he was well informed what they accused our Saviour of: and it is fully evident from his own words, that he rather chose they should have put him to death in their own way.

<sup>r</sup> In Joan. xviii. 30. *Si non esset hic malefactor, non tibi tradissemus eum*; simul, ut credibile est, aliqua attulerunt de sabbatho, et similia.

<sup>s</sup> Matt. x. 17.

*shall deliver you up to the councils*<sup>t</sup>. *He that says to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council*<sup>u</sup>. And to the Jews he says, *Behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes, and some of them shall ye kill and crucify*<sup>x</sup>. And in another place, *Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay*<sup>y</sup>. I am far from thinking that these places determine the question; but surely the most natural construction of them is, that there remained in the Jewish councils a power of inflicting death. The answer which our Lord made to the Scribes and Pharisees, who brought to him a woman taken in adultery, is, *He that is without sin, let him cast the first stone at her*<sup>z</sup>. It was commanded in the law of Moses that the witnesses or accusers should throw the first stone; and the meaning of our Lord's answer is plainly this; Let him among you who has not been guilty of the same crime, or a crime equally great, be a witness against her, or become her accuser and prosecutor before the council. It is not to be supposed that our Lord here takes upon him the part of a judge. This in another case he utterly disclaims, saying to the person that desired it of him, *Who made me a judge over you*<sup>a</sup>? much less can we suppose that he would countenance a popular and tumultuary execution<sup>b</sup>,

<sup>t</sup> Mark xiii. 9.<sup>u</sup> Matt. v. 22.<sup>x</sup> Matt. xxiii. 34.<sup>y</sup> Luke xi. 49.<sup>z</sup> John viii. 7.<sup>a</sup> Luke xii. 14.

<sup>b</sup> The interpretation of the learned Grotius represents him, I think, as too much favouring this sort of execution. Upon those words, *Let him that is without sin cast the first stone*, he has this note: Quia lapidatio illis temporibus erat quasi judicium populi, ideo quod de judicibus dici solet, populo aptavit. But,



or encourage any persons to lay violent hands on a criminal before sentence was passed by those who were in authority. Our Lord's answer, therefore, by a very common figure of speech, and in an equitable construction, amounts to no more than this: "Let him among you that is not guilty of a like sin, accuse and prosecute her before the council." Which answer plainly supposes that the Mosaic law in all its forms was at this time executed. And who can we think would put it thus in execution if the Jewish magistrates were not permitted?

The four evangelists are unanimous that the Jews attempted to prosecute our Saviour for the capital crime of sabbath-breaking, and to cause him to suffer the pains of death for it. St. Matthew says, *They*

with the leave of so great a man, it was not the judges, but the witnesses or accusers, that were to throw the first stone. He speaks this to the people that brought the woman therefore, not as judges, but as witnesses or accusers. And upon those words, *Hath no man condemned thee?* his note is, Quasi dicat, Si lata est in te sententia, ego ei non contradico. But that there is no necessity of understanding this of a proper condemnation by a judge, appears from his own remark on the fifteenth verse: Accusatores et testes condemnare Latine dicuntur. And he interprets the Greek word κατακρίνειν, here used, to the same sense in his notes on Matt. xii. 41. Heb. xi. 7. We have no reason therefore, from the use of this word, to make the people, who brought the woman to our Saviour, judges: it might very justly be said of them, although they were no more than witnesses or accusers. The learned Dr. Lightfoot supposes that the Scribes and Pharisees who brought this woman before our Lord might be members of the great sanhedrim; and that those words, *Hath no man condemned thee?* intimate, that those who accused her had also power to judge and condemn her. Thus, *the Scribes and Pharisees*, he thinks, signify the sanhedrim. Matt. xxiii. 2. vol. 2. p. 1080.



*asked him, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath-day? that they might accuse him*<sup>c</sup>. And because in his answer he determined that it was lawful, and actually healed a person who had a withered hand before them, it is added, *The Pharisees held a council against him, how they might destroy him*<sup>d</sup>. St. Mark says, *They watched him, whether he would heal on the sabbath-day, that they might accuse him*<sup>e</sup>. St. Luke says the same<sup>f</sup>. To whom would they accuse him? Is it at all likely that a Roman governor would put a man to death for doing so beneficent an action on the sabbath-day? As it would be difficult to convince him that the crime of sabbath-breaking deserved death, it would be much more so to persuade him that the doing good on that day could be criminal: but the Jewish council would have readily received such an accusation. If the Talmud may be at all credited, it was every way agreeable to their maxims to proceed against and pronounce a man guilty of death for such an action as this<sup>g</sup>. Who then can admit a doubt that

<sup>c</sup> Ch. xii. 10.<sup>d</sup> Ver. 14.<sup>e</sup> Ch. ii. 3.<sup>f</sup> Ch. vi. 7.

<sup>g</sup> It was a rule with them, That what might be done on the eve of the sabbath dispensed not with the sabbath. This agrees exactly with that which the ruler of the synagogue says to the people, Luke xiii. 14. *There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath-day.* They thought that the withered hand might as well have been restored on any other day, and that the woman might have been healed of the spirit of infirmity on the eve before; and therefore that the doing it on the sabbath was breaking the sabbath, and deserved death. Talm. Sabbath, cap. 19. They allowed, indeed, that the danger of life dispensed with the sabbath. Tanch. fol. 9. col. 2. but in neither of the cases above mentioned would

our Saviour was to have been prosecuted before them? and how did he avoid the threatening danger? By withdrawing himself from under their jurisdiction to the tetrarchy of Galilee<sup>h</sup>.

In like manner, when our Lord had healed the man at the pool of Bethesda, and ordered him to take up his bed and walk, St. John says, *Therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath-day*<sup>i</sup>. The word which we translate *persecute* is a law term, and signifies to prosecute or accuse in a court of justice. In all probability they had actually commenced a prosecution against him before the great council for breach of the sabbath, and sought means to apprehend and convict him. Our Lord afterwards gave them further offence in calling God his Father; and the evangelist adds, *Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he had not only broken the sabbath, but said also that* they admit that there was danger of life. Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 1. p. 222. and vol. 2. p. 187.

<sup>h</sup> *But Jesus withdrew himself with his disciples to the sea*, i. e. the sea of Galilee, Mark iii. 7. Vid. et Matt. xii. 15. It is not indeed absolutely certain where our Saviour was when he healed the withered hand; but it is probable that he was in some part of Judæa: that he was now in his way from Jerusalem, where he had been celebrating the passover, to go to Galilee, is sufficiently evident from the circumstances of the history when laid together, and is the opinion, I think, of Dr. Lightfoot, vol. 1. p. 221, 222. Vid. vol. 2. p. 184. Father Pezron indeed conjectures, that when he cured the withered hand he was already arrived in some part of Galilee, from the mention of the *Herodians*. *Histoire Evangel.* vol. 2. p. 74. Can there be a more slight foundation for such a conjecture? Might there not be Herodians going from the feast at Jerusalem to Galilee as well as our Saviour?

<sup>i</sup> John v. 16.

*God was his Father, making himself equal with God*<sup>k</sup>. There were two capital crimes therefore that the Jews would have convicted him of, and put him to death for, had he not immediately left Jerusalem. For the apostle says, *After these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee*<sup>l</sup>. And again, at the beginning of the next chapter<sup>m</sup>, *Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Jewry, because the Jews sought to kill him*. He withdrew from their jurisdiction. If they had not sought to take away his life in a course of law by accusing him of capital crimes, why should he industriously avoid all Judæa, all places that were under their jurisdiction? Had it been their design to have despatched him by a private hand, or a popular tumult, he might have escaped these as well by withdrawing into some of the remoter parts of Judæa as by going into Galilee. Or had it been their intention to have made interest with the Roman governor to execute him, could they not as easily have prevailed with Herod the tetrarch to do the same? I can see no reason therefore why he so industriously avoided all Judæa, but because he thereby avoided the jurisdiction of the Jewish sanhedrim.

Our Lord appeared again at Jerusalem at the feast of tabernacles. It was so well known to the people of that city that he was under prosecution for capital crimes, that they are struck with astonishment to see him discoursing in public, and no one apprehend him. *Then said some of them of Jerusalem, Is not this he whom they seek to kill? But, lo, he speaketh boldly, and they say nothing unto*

<sup>k</sup> John v. 18.<sup>l</sup> John vi. 1.<sup>m</sup> John vii. 1.

*him. Do the rulers know indeed that this is the very Christ<sup>n</sup>?* It is plain from these last words that they looked upon it as the business of the rulers or magistrates to apprehend him and put him to death. The evangelist, in what follows, tells us it was owing wholly to the overruling providence of God that he was not at that time taken by them. For several of the by-standers had a strong inclination to apprehend him, yet did not, being in some secret manner prevented by him who disposes of all events<sup>o</sup>. Nay, the Pharisees and chief priests sent officers on purpose to bring him<sup>p</sup>; but they, delighted and quite overcome with his discourse, return without him<sup>q</sup>. The Pharisees, in rebuking the officers for neglect of duty, plainly declare him to be an impostor<sup>r</sup>. Nicodemus, one of the council, who believed him to be the Messiah, says to them, *Does our law judge, i. e. condemn, any man as an impostor or malefactor before it hear him, and know what he doth<sup>s</sup>?* He puts them in mind that the law of Moses obliged them to give him a hearing before they pronounced him a deceiver or false prophet. I leave it wholly to the reader to determine what is the import of these passages in the most easy and natural construction; whether that the Jewish magistrates did now execute their laws in capital cases, or did not.

<sup>n</sup> John vii. 25, 26.

<sup>o</sup> *Then they sought to take him: but no man laid hands on him, because his hour was not yet come, ver. 30. And some of the people would have taken him; but no man laid hands on him, v. 44.*

<sup>p</sup> Ver. 32.    <sup>q</sup> Ver. 45, 46.    <sup>r</sup> Ver. 47, 48, 49.    <sup>s</sup> Ver. 51.

## SECT. XVII.

*Further arguments from the Gospels.*

AFTER the resurrection of Lazarus, the chief priests and Pharisees gather a council, deliberate, and at length determine that it was fitting to put Jesus to death; and issue forth their orders, *that if any man knew where he were, he should shew it, that they might take him*<sup>t</sup>. Our Lord, to escape the effect of this order, for the little time that yet remained before the passover, walked no more openly among the Jews, and went to a remote part of Judæa, near the wilderness<sup>u</sup>. We are told in the next chapter, that *the chief priests consulted also how they might put Lazarus to death*<sup>x</sup>. These places, if taken in their obvious sense, clearly enough shew what I am contending for; but that which makes it appear to me in a yet stronger light, is the fear of the people, so frequently expressed. Thus is it said in St. Matthew, *When the chief priests and Pharisees sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet*<sup>y</sup>. And again, the chief priests, and Scribes, and Elders of the people, assembled at the palace of the high priest, consulted that they might take Jesus by subtilty, and kill him; but *they said, not on the feast-day, lest there be an uproar among the people*<sup>z</sup>. Thus also it is said in St. Mark, *The Scribes and chief priests sought how they might destroy him: for they feared him, because all the people were astonished at his doctrine*<sup>a</sup>. And again, *They*

<sup>t</sup> John xi. 47, &c.

<sup>u</sup> Ver. 54.

<sup>x</sup> John xii. 10.

<sup>y</sup> Matt. xxi. 46.

<sup>z</sup> Matt. xxvi. 4, 5.

<sup>a</sup> Mark xi. 18.



sought to lay hold on him, but feared the people<sup>b</sup>. So in the Gospel of St. Luke, *The chief priests, and the Scribes, and the chief of the people, sought to destroy him; and could not find what they might do: for all the people were very attentive to hear him*<sup>c</sup>. Again, *The chief priests and the Scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him; and they feared the people*<sup>d</sup>. And again, *The chief priests and Scribes sought how they might kill him; for they feared the people*<sup>e</sup>. In like manner it is said in the History of the Acts, when the council had further threatened Peter and John, *they let them go, finding nothing how they might punish them, because of the people: for all men glorified God for that which was done*<sup>f</sup>. It is said also of the officers, that they brought the apostles before the council *without violence: for they feared the people, lest they should have been stoned*<sup>g</sup>. When it is so often said that the rulers of the Jewish nation sought means to put Jesus to death, had it been meant that they would have put him to death by a private hand, in an extrajudicial manner, or have suborned witnesses to accuse him of some capital crime before the Roman governor, or by the weight of their influence have prevailed with the governor to order his execution, though evidence of the crimes alleged against him were wanting; I say, if any of these were the things meant, whence could arise the *fear of the people*, so frequently and strongly expressed? All these things might have been so man-

<sup>b</sup> Mark xii. 12.<sup>c</sup> Luke xix. 47, 48.<sup>d</sup> Luke xx. 19.<sup>e</sup> Luke xxii. 2.<sup>f</sup> Acts iv. 21.<sup>g</sup> Acts v. 26. Vid. Luke

xx. 6. Matt. xxi. 26.



aged as that the authors of them should have lain concealed. Might not the hand which gave the fatal blow have remained a secret? At least the persons who set the assassin to work would have remained unknown; for who could oblige him to disclose it when the magistrates were on his side? And if they had employed any to accuse him to Pilate, how could it have been discovered who they were which gave the witnesses their instructions? And if they determined to influence the governor even against evidence, how could it have been known by whose particular persuasion he was so overcome as to order the execution?

But should we admit, what it must be owned is very difficult to be admitted, that none of these things would have remained a secret, could any of them, though known and public, be ground of fear to the whole body of the Jewish magistracy? For it is said of the chief priests, the Scribes, and the Elders, i. e. of the Jewish magistracy in general, it is said of the whole council or court of judges, that they were afraid of the people. Had any of the foregoing methods been taken, there could not well have been many of them active in the affair. It is most likely that the execution of the method fixed upon would have been committed to a very few: which few, indeed, upon a discovery, might have apprehensions of the people's resentment, but not the whole body. On the other hand, if the great council of the nation intended to proceed in a judicial way to condemn and execute Jesus against the prevailing bent and inclination of the people, who held him as a prophet, here is a plain reason for that general fear expressed. Herod the tetrarch,

whose authority in capital judgments I suppose no one ever questioned, suspended the execution of John the Baptist for a while, from the very same apprehension. St. Matthew says, that when he would have put John the Baptist to death for the freedom of his reproofs, *he feared the multitude, because they counted him as a prophet*<sup>h</sup>. The expression is exactly the same with some of those we have before recited concerning the Jewish magistrates. Had they sought to put Jesus to death by secret means, the authors and instigators, when found out, might have been afraid. Had they endeavoured it by spiriting up persons to accuse him to the governor, the witnesses and prompters, when known, might have been afraid. Had they resolved upon it by persuading the governor, the persons who prevailed with him, when discovered, might have been afraid. But that this should affect the whole body of the Jewish magistracy, and that while the discovery was yet uncertain, and I may add not a little improbable, seems wholly incredible. It must therefore be an act of the great council of the Jewish nation, or body of their chief magistrates, which is referred to in those several places of the Gospels where this general fear is expressed : and what can that be, but their sitting in judgment on Jesus, condemning him, and ordering his execution? They were afraid to do this because of the multitude, in the same manner as Herod was afraid to execute John the Baptist : and that they were in truth afraid to act in their judicial capacity is fully expressed to us in one of those places quoted from the

<sup>h</sup> Matt. xiv. 5.

History of the Acts. For there it is said of the whole council, in the case of Peter and John, that *they let them go, finding nothing how they might punish them, because of the people.* The reason given why they did not proceed against them and punish them was, their *fear of the people.*

And it is evident that this fear, in the case of our Saviour, drove them to the expedient of becoming accusers instead of judges, as the safer method of the two. For if upon accusing him to the Roman governor, (whether any of their own body had been witnesses against him, or they had employed others,) he had been condemned and executed, and there had followed a popular insurrection, this would have been esteemed and treated as an insurrection not against the Jewish magistrates but against the Roman governor, who had an army at hand immediately to have suppressed it, and would have severely animadverted upon those who were forwardest in raising it. Being afraid then to act as judges, they determine to have him prosecuted before the governor for some crime against the Roman state; and to this end employ persons to ensnare him in his discourse, which is clearly intimated to us by the evangelist Luke: *And the chief priests and the Scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him; and they feared the people: for they perceived that he had spoken this parable against them. And they watched him, and sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor*<sup>i</sup>. From the connection of these verses it

<sup>i</sup> Chap. xx. 19, 20, &c.

is plain, that as their *fear of the people* was the reason they durst not proceed against him themselves, so it put them upon the expedient of drawing from him something which might render him obnoxious to the Roman governor. They contrive a question, the answer of which they hoped would be treason against the Roman state. The question was, *Whether it be lawful to give tribute to Cæsar?* They suspected, probably, that our Saviour was of the opinion of Judas the Galilæan, and would have immediately answered, that it was not lawful; at least, that he durst not give any other answer when urged to it, because this was an opinion which had now made great progress among the people. And they, it is likely, imagined that he chiefly aimed at the favour of the people, and stood in awe of their resentment.

And when our Saviour was, beyond their expectation, betrayed into their hands by one of his own disciples, at a time and place which admitted of few or no witnesses, and the fittest that could be to prevent a popular tumult, they (indeed during the night) examine him of the supposed crimes against their own law, but early the next <sup>k</sup> morning deliver him to the Roman governor, accusing him of crimes against the Roman state. Their precipitate manner of acting plainly demonstrates the greatness of their fear: it was contrary to their law to execute any one on a sabbath-day; they did not dare to delay his execution, lest the people should rise; they hasten with him therefore to Pilate as soon as possibly they could with any tolerable decency, and

<sup>k</sup> John xviii. 28. Matt. xxvii. 1, 2.

prevail with him to condemn him. And this they did the more willingly because they herein gratified their malice by seeing him die the most ignominious and cruel death. And thus our Lord's prediction had its accomplishment.

I have now said all that I think necessary on this question; and what appears to me fully sufficient to prove, that it was permitted the Jewish magistrates under Roman governors to execute their own laws, by inflicting capital punishments. Should any learned man be of a contrary opinion, I should be heartily glad to see his reasons published to the world, and should think myself not a little obliged to him to be set right in any thing wherein I am mistaken. As this is a question that has not yet been thoroughly treated by the learned, it will be no small pleasure to me to see it fully discussed, and the truth fixed upon a solid and immovable foundation.



## CHAP. VI. PART II.

*Shewing that the authority of the high priest and Jewish magistrates, in the affairs of religion, extended to foreign cities.*

I PROCEED now to the second question, which is, How the authority of the high priest and Jewish council could be extended to Damascus and foreign cities? Whatever authority the Jewish magistrates might exercise in their own country under the Romans, whether by express grant, or by connivance, is it at all credible that their power should reach to other countries? St. Paul says, *I persecuted the saints even unto strange cities*<sup>1</sup>. And again, *I went to Damascus, with authority and commission from the chief priests*<sup>m</sup>. And Ananias says of St. Paul, *Here, that is, at Damascus, he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name*<sup>n</sup>. In order to clear up this matter, it must be observed that the letters or commission which St. Paul petitioned for, and carried to Damascus, were not directed to the magistrates of the city, but to the Jews which inhabited it. It is said that *he went unto the high priest, and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem*<sup>o</sup>. And he says himself, *Of the high priest, and all the state of the Elders, I received letters unto the brethren, that is, the Jews at Damascus, and went to Damascus, to bring*

<sup>1</sup> Acts xxvi. 11.<sup>m</sup> Ver. 12.<sup>n</sup> Ch. ix. 13, 14.<sup>o</sup> Ch. ix. 1, 2.

*them which were there bound unto Jerusalem, for to be punished*<sup>p</sup>. The authority of the high priest and sanhedrim was acknowledged by the Jews wherever they lived. And it was usual for the Jews dispersed in foreign nations to receive orders and directions by letters from the great council at Jerusalem, which orders they diligently followed<sup>q</sup>. This is a thing that may easily be apprehended by us, who know how universally the authority of the bishop of Rome is submitted to by papists, even though they inhabit protestant countries. There can be no difficulty therefore to conceive, that the chief rulers of the synagogues at Damascus would readily comply with the import of the letters sent them from the great council at Jerusalem, would willingly apprehend and convey to Jerusalem the persons described. The only difficulty is, whether the magistrates of Damascus would suffer the Jews to imprison their subjects, and send them to Jerusalem to be punished. If they would not, Saul had been disappointed in his aim; and it is no unusual thing for your hot, furious persecutors to act in many things rashly, and meet with disappointments. But it was not Saul alone; the sanhedrim also no doubt judged that the magistrates of Damascus would permit this to be done; otherwise, surely they would not have come into Saul's measures, and granted him the letters he petitioned for.

Damascus was a city conquered by the Romans, who granted to the Jews every where to live according to their own laws. This probably included in it

<sup>p</sup> Acts xxii. 4, 5.      <sup>q</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 282, 283. vol. 2. p. 681, 2. Seld. de Anno civil. cap. 9.

a permission to scourge, and use lesser punishments in their synagogues, and also to apprehend and send to Jerusalem greater delinquents, who deserved a more severe animadversion. We know it included a permission to send annually from every part of the Roman empire large sums of money to Jerusalem, which was of far greater consequence than their sending now and then a delinquent to be punished. Not only those who were born of Jewish parents, but all who were proselyted to the Jewish religion, contributed to the expenses of divine worship at Jerusalem, and usually sent many voluntary offerings besides<sup>r</sup>. The amount of these collections was so great, that the governors of provinces were sometimes uneasy at it, and for that reason seized the money, and laid a restraint on the Jews that they should send no more, as did Flaccus in Asia<sup>s</sup>. Titus, in the speech he made to the Jews after having taken Jerusalem, sets this matter in a just light: “The kindness of the Romans, says Cæsar, has ex-  
“cited you against the Romans. We first of all  
“gave you the country to inhabit, and placed over  
“you kings of your own nation. Afterwards (that  
“is, when Judæa was made a Roman province) we  
“preserved to you your own country laws, and per-

<sup>r</sup> Pessimus quisque spretis religionibus patriis tributa et stipes illuc congeriebant. Unde auctæ Judæorum res. *Tac. Hist.* l. 5. n. 5.

<sup>s</sup> Cum aurum Judæorum nomine quotannis ex Italia et ex omnibus vestris provinciis Hierosolymam exportari soleret, Flaccus sanxit edicto, ne ex Asia exportari liceret. *Cic. pro Flacco*, c. 28. (67.) This was much more frequently done by the governors or magistrates of particular cities. *Vid. Jos. Antiq.* l. 16. c. 2. §. 3. et c. 6.

“ mitted you to live, not only among yourselves, but  
 “ with others also as you would. But what is most  
 “ of all, we suffered you to raise a tribute, and col-  
 “ lect offerings for the Deity, and neither admonished  
 “ nor forbad those who offered them, although you,  
 “ our enemies, became richer than ourselves, and  
 “ armed yourselves against us with our own money<sup>t</sup>. ”  
 Titus represents it as an instance of greater kindness in the Romans, that they suffered the Jews to collect money in all the provinces, and convey it to Jerusalem, than permitting them the use of their own laws ; and at the same time shews, that it was of far more dangerous consequence to the Roman power <sup>u</sup>.

There is a decree of Julius Cæsar extant, wherein is a clause, giving a power to the high priest of the Jews to determine all differences that should happen about the Jewish institution <sup>x</sup>. This clause most certainly relates to those Jews who inhabited foreign places under the Roman dominion. For it is therein decreed, that Hyrcanus and his sons should be ethnarchs of the Jews, and enjoy the high-priesthood for ever, according to their country laws. This constituted him and his sons after him judges of all

<sup>t</sup> Jos. Bell. Jud. l. 6. c. 6. §. 2. p. 1284, fin.

<sup>u</sup> This seems also to be the sense of Tacitus, when he adds those words, *Unde auctæ Judæorum res*.

<sup>x</sup> “ Ἄν δὲ μεταξὺ γένηται τις ζήτησις περὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἀγωγῆς, ἀρέσκει μοι κρίσιν γενέσθαι παρ’ αὐτοῦ, vel potius παρ’ αὐτοῖς, ut apud Cod. Lugd. Batavos præstantissimos quondam Isaac. Vossii. Jos. Antiq. l. 14. c. 10. §. 2. because the grant runs all along to him, and to his sons, who were to be his successors. The sons indeed were yet to be born when the grant was made, nor do we read that he ever had a son.

who were within the ethnarchy granted him. The other clause therefore, whereby he and his sons after him are made judges of all differences that should happen about the Jewish institution, must unquestionably relate to those who inhabited places that were not within his own dominion. For which reason this law was sent by Julius Cæsar, when second time dictator, to the magistrates of Sidon, and ordered to be laid up among their public records. He also commanded it to be engraven in copper tables both in Greek and Latin, and to be dedicated. To what end, if it did not concern them? And how could it concern them any otherwise, than that they should permit the high priest of the Jewish nation to determine all religious differences among the Jews which inhabited with them; and when the case required it, should suffer such of them as had transgressed the Mosaic institution to be sent to Jerusalem, to be there tried before him?

It is true, there is another decree of Julius Cæsar, which conveys some rights in Sidon to Hyrcanus and his sons: "The fourth of what was sown was "to be paid him by way of tribute every other year. "Besides which, they were to pay him tithe in the "same manner as had been paid to his ancestors." Which is a very good reason why this decree, making over such rights, should be sent to Sidon, and be placed among their records; but can be no reason why the former decree, specifying no such rights, should be sent there. Sidon was at this time a free city. The constituting Hyrcanus ethnarch and high priest of the Jews, could give him no right to any

thing in Sidon without a specific grant, which is accordingly made him in this latter decree.

There is another decree of the same Julius Cæsar, preserved by Josephus, together with the foregoing, and immediately following the first named, whereby he makes the high priest and ethnarch of the Jews, patron of the injured Jews<sup>z</sup>. That this is to be understood of all the Jews throughout the whole Roman empire is evident, from that it is ordered to be engraven in Roman and Greek letters upon copper tables, which were to be dedicated in the Capitol, and at Sidon and Tyre, and Ascalon, and in the temples; and it is commanded, that this decree be carried to all questors and governors of every city, and to those states and kingdoms which were in friendship with the Romans. And we find that Hyrcanus did frequently interpose in behalf of the Jews injured in Asia and other parts, and obtained redress for them<sup>a</sup>. Now, for my own part, I cannot make the least doubt, but that the first-mentioned decree of Julius Cæsar, constituting Hyrcanus judge of all the differences that should happen about the Jewish institution, was sent (not to Sidon only, but) to all the questors and governors of every city, and to all states and kingdoms in friendship with the Romans, in the very same manner with this, which makes him patron of the injured Jews. It may indeed be here asked, Why then is not this expressed as well in the one decree as in the other? and I am fully of the opinion, that so it was in the original decree; but our misfortune is, that we have

<sup>z</sup> Antiq. l. 14. c. 10. §. 3.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. §. 11, 12. 20. 22.



parts only, and not the whole of these decrees, transmitted down to us <sup>b</sup>.

That the Jews had a court in every city where any considerable number of them inhabited, to decide all controversies that should happen among them in religious affairs, cannot, I think, admit of a doubt: since without this they could not well live agreeably to their own laws, and since it is so fully expressed in the decree of Lucius Antonius, directed to the magistrates of Sardis: “The Jews came to me, and signified that they held assemblies of their own according to their country laws from the beginning, and had a place of their own in which they determined affairs and controversies that arose among themselves: and petitioning me, that it might be lawful for them to continue this, I decreed to permit them <sup>c</sup>.” To whom should appeals lie from these courts? Was it not natural that the Jews should desire, that in all affairs too difficult to be determined by these courts, they should remit the cause to the high priest and sanhedrim at Jerusalem? This is the very thing granted them by the forementioned decree of Julius Cæsar <sup>d</sup>.

We have no particular account, indeed, that they

<sup>b</sup> Vid. §. 3. et 5. et not. ad §. 3. et 7.

<sup>c</sup> Antiq. l. 14. c. 10. §. 17.

<sup>d</sup> It was for this great favour, probably, that the Jews discovered such excessive sorrow at his death: In summo publico luctu exterarum gentium multitudo circulatim suo quæque more lamentata est, præcipueque Judæi, qui etiam noctibus continuibustum frequentarunt. *Suet. Jul.* c. 84. n. 8: whereas the Roman people remained there but one night. Vid. Not. Pitisci. Appian. B. C. 11. p. 521.

were ever interrupted in this privilege of appealing, as we find they often were with regard to some other privileges, such as the exemption from being enlisted in the Roman army, and sending their collections to Jerusalem ; but the reason is plain. The cases of appeal wherein the parties were obliged themselves to attend at Jerusalem seldom happened ; and the cases wherein either of the parties were unwilling to go, and it was necessary to use force, much seldomer : and we may take it for granted, that when persons had so far transgressed the Mosaic institution as to deserve the animadversion of the high priest and sanhedrim at Jerusalem, they usually renounced Judaism, and conformed to the rites and customs of their heathen neighbours ; in which case the high priest had no more power over them.

To all that has been now said, it may be objected, that this decree of Julius Cæsar extended only to Hyrcanus and his sons, who should succeed him in his ethnarchy and priesthood ; and therefore does not reach the times we are speaking of, when St. Paul went to Damascus : for none of the offspring of Hyrcanus were then high priests. The reply to this is, that there was afterwards a decree made by Augustus Cæsar, that the Jews should enjoy their own laws in the same manner as they had done under Hyrcanus<sup>e</sup>. By comparing the preface of this decree with that of Julius Cæsar first quoted by us, it is easy to perceive that Augustus had that before him when he made this. The decree of Julius Cæsar is introduced thus : “ Forasmuch as Hyrcanus “ the son of Alexander the Jew, both now and in

<sup>e</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 16. c. 6. §. 2.

“ former times, as well in peace as in war, has shewn  
“ both fidelity and industry in our affairs, as many  
“ generals have testified of him, and in the last war  
“ at Alexandria came to our assistance with one  
“ thousand five hundred auxiliaries, and being sent  
“ by me against Mithridates, exceeded all the army  
“ in bravery.” The decree of Augustus begins thus :  
“ Forasmuch as the Jewish nation have been found  
“ grateful to the Roman people, not only at this pre-  
“ sent, but in past times, and especially under my  
“ father Cæsar the emperor, and particularly their  
“ high priest Hyrcanus, it seemeth meet to me, and  
“ my council, that the Jews use their own customs  
“ according to their own country laws, as they used  
“ them under Hyrcanus.” This law was made by  
Augustus upon complaint of the Jews of Asia and  
Cyrene, that they were interrupted and hindered in  
some part of their customs by the cities where they  
dwelt, and is ordered by him to be dedicated in that  
most famous temple erected to himself by the com-  
munity of Asia. This is a further proof, that the  
clause alleged from the decree of Julius Cæsar  
reached the Jews of all places under the Roman  
dominion. It does not appear that the Jews had  
allowance to live according to their own country  
laws in foreign cities by virtue of any decree of  
Julius Cæsar now extant, excepting this : and this  
does not enact that they should so live, but takes it  
for granted that they did so live by virtue of former  
laws passed in their favour ; and the particular it  
enacts is, that Hyrcanus and his sons after him  
should be judges of all their differences in religious  
affairs. Augustus, having this very edict before  
him, further decrees, that the Jews in Asia, Cyrene,

and throughout the Roman empire, should use their own customs, according to their own country laws, in the same manner as they had been used by them under Hyrcanus the high priest. Which, as it fully shews that the alleged clause related to all the Jews under the Roman government, so it gave to the high priest and sanhedrim at Jerusalem the very same power which had been granted to Hyrcanus and his sons by Julius Cæsar, and constituted them judges of all the disputes in religious affairs that should happen among the Jews inhabiting any part of the Roman empire.

If Damascus was at this time under Aretas king of Arabia Deserta, as we know it was a few years after, when St. Paul made his escape from a window<sup>f</sup>, he was a king subject to the Romans, and durst not act in contradiction to their laws. It is very probable also, that in the present case he had not the least inclination so to do. It is not impossible but he might himself be a Jew: some of the Arabians were so<sup>g</sup>. This we know, that his daughter was a Jewess, because he had married her to Herod, tetrarch of Galilee<sup>h</sup>. It is not likely therefore that he would be less favourable to the Jews than were the Romans.

<sup>f</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33.  
ran, p. 22, pr.

<sup>g</sup> Sale's Prelim. Disc. to the Alcoran,

<sup>h</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 18. c. 5. §. 1.

## CHAP. VII.

*More Jewish customs confirmed.*

ST. PAUL says, *When the saints were put to death, I gave my voice against them*<sup>i</sup>. This is thought to relate to the death of St. Stephen only. For he says, *And when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him*<sup>k</sup>. Likewise St. Luke in relating the fact says, *And the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul*<sup>l</sup>.—*And Saul was consenting to his death*<sup>m</sup>. This is generally understood as the whole which is meant by its being said, that *he gave his voice against the saints* when they were put to death, that is, that he fully approved of the death of St. Stephen, and demonstrated he did so by taking charge of the raiment of the witnesses, when they stripped themselves to stone him. We read not of any other Christians that were put to death before his conversion, and for this reason alone is the meaning of the words confined to St. Stephen's death. But it is not unlikely there might be several others: for the History of the Acts is very brief, and doubtless passes over many more things than it relates<sup>n</sup>. If there were several others put to death besides St. Stephen, I can see nothing that may hinder us from taking the words in their literal sense. Might

<sup>i</sup> Acts xxvi. 10.<sup>k</sup> Acts xxii. 20.<sup>l</sup> Acts vii. 58.<sup>m</sup> Acts ix. 1.<sup>n</sup> Vid. 2 Cor. xi. 23, &c. where you will find many facts even in the history of St. Paul, which are not related in the Acts.

not St. Paul have been a judge in one of the courts of Twenty-three? might he not have been a disciple in one of those three orders which always sat in the courts of Twenty-three, and upon some of these occasions have been called upon the bench<sup>o</sup>? That he was ordained and raised to the dignity of an elder<sup>p</sup>, the learned Selden says, is not in the least to be doubted<sup>q</sup>. Vitringa is of the same opinion, and collects it from that honourable office which was given him by the great sanhedrim, being sent as their commissioner to all the synagogues. This he compares with the office which afterwards was known in the Theodosian code by the name of *apostolus patriarchæ*<sup>r</sup>, and was next in dignity to that of the patriarch himself.

It may seem strange to some, that St. Paul was not excommunicated by the Jews after he turned Christian; for St. John tells us, *the Jews had agreed, that if any man did confess that Jesus was the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue*<sup>s</sup>. St. Paul, notwithstanding, entered boldly into their synagogues wherever he came, and preached that

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 2. c. 6. §. 2. p. 1322, 1323. Synedrionum viginti triumviralium fuere judicia—capitalia et criminalia omnigena quæ haud inter casus illos reservatos reperta. Ibid. c. 10. §. 3. p. 1435, prope init.

<sup>p</sup> No person could be a judge unless he were first ordained an elder, though all elders were not immediately judges.

<sup>q</sup> Presbyteratus autem dignitatem antedictam ab Gamaliele accepisse Paulum, antequam Christo nomen dederat, non videtur omnino dubitandum. *De Syned.* l. 2. c. 7. §. 7. p. 1360. Vid. et l. 1. c. 14. p. 1099, pr. et med.

<sup>r</sup> *De Synag. vet.* l. 3. p. 1. c. 7. p. 707. Quid vetat credere hos vere ritu Judaico, &c.

<sup>s</sup> John ix. 22.



Jesus was the Christ. He was often scourged by them. He says himself, *Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one*<sup>t</sup>; but we nowhere read of his being excommunicated. The Talmud explains this to us. It is thence abundantly evident, that they were very backward to excommunicate the disciples of the wise, the doctors and teachers of the law<sup>u</sup>. If such committed crimes worthy of excommunication, they scourged them, but were unwilling to excommunicate them. This is represented in the Babylonish Talmud, as having been more particularly the custom which prevailed in the Holy Land<sup>x</sup>. Scourging among the Jews left no mark of infamy, nor was any diminution of a person's dignity, so that the high priest himself was subject to this punishment, and it might be inflicted on him even by the court of Three<sup>y</sup>. It may possibly be asked, how it came to pass that St. Paul submitted to be scourged by the Jews without pleading the privilege of a Roman citizen, as he did when ordered to be scourged by Lysias, and when beaten by the magistrates of Philippi? The answer is obvious. Forasmuch as he professed a subjection to

<sup>t</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 24.

<sup>u</sup> Neque inter juris studiosos reperitur aliquis, quem temere, seu sine summa deliberatione, excommunicare fas erat, ne quidem foro. *Maimon. Talmud tora. cap. 7. Vid. Seld. de Jure Nat. l. 4. c. 9. p. 487. Vit. de Synag. vet. l. 3. p. 1. c. 2. p. 774, 775.*

<sup>x</sup> Gemara ad tit. Moed katon et ad tit. Pesachim. Vid. Seld. de Syned. l. 1. c. 7. p. 854. Buxtorf. Lex. p. 2464, and 2465. For the same reason probably they did not excommunicate Christ himself; for the people heard him as a prophet, a great rabbi, or teacher. Vid. Vit. de Synag. vet. l. 3. p. 1. c. 2. p. 780.

<sup>y</sup> Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 10. §. 4. p. 1437. §. 6. p. 1440. c. 13. §. 6. p. 1503. §. 9. p. 1515. et l. 3. c. 8. §. 2. p. 1665.

the Jewish laws, it was in vain for him to plead this privilege. The Romans allowed the Jews the use of their own laws. Roman citizens themselves, if Jews, were to undergo the penalties prescribed in the Jewish laws<sup>z</sup>.

§. 2. St. Paul being an ordained elder, doctor, or teacher, there cannot be much difficulty in understanding how he was admitted to preach in all the synagogues which he entered. The same thing may be said of Barnabas; for he also is called a doctor or teacher<sup>a</sup>. But can the same thing be said of our Saviour and the twelve apostles? It may doubtless be alleged, that from the many and great miracles they performed they were taken for prophets by the people; and it cannot be easily supposed, that under the Jewish institution there was not always a permission for such to speak and teach in their synagogues<sup>b</sup>. But if we consult Maimonides and the Talmud, we shall find that it was allowed to all persons among the Jews to speak in their synagogues<sup>c</sup>. And the same liberty, we are told, has continued among them even down to modern times<sup>d</sup>.

It is now, I think, unknown, and at this distance of time it is no manner of wonder it should, how the doctors and teachers distinguished themselves, so as to be taken for such when they entered the syna-

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 15. §. 11. fin. p. 1564.

<sup>a</sup> Acts xiii. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 1. p. 612, 613. vol. 2. p. 136, pr.

<sup>c</sup> Taanith, cap. 4. §. 2. Vid. Vit. de Synag. vet. l. 3. p. 1. c. 7. p. 705.

<sup>d</sup> Reliquo tempore transiens forte hospes, aut quicumque alius, qui eruditionis fiduciam habet, atque se aliquid recitatione dignum excogitasse opinatur, de eo disserere instituit. *Leo de Modena in Wagensellio*. Vid. Vit. de Syn. p. 705.

gogue. That they were known for such, is generally concluded from a passage in the Acts. When Paul and Barnabas were in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, it is said, *the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on<sup>e</sup>*. It is commonly thought there were seats in every synagogue peculiar to those who came with a design to teach; that the rulers therefore might well know that Paul and Barnabas designed to speak, from their seating themselves in those places. This, I think, has no other foundation than those words, that *Paul and Barnabas went into the synagogue, and sat down*; that is, say learned men who are of this opinion<sup>f</sup>, in the seats appointed for the doctors and teachers. The learned Dr. Lightfoot, in one part of his works, supposes they might be distinguished by their phylacteries<sup>g</sup>. But possibly Paul and Barnabas might have given notice of their intention to the rulers when they first entered the synagogue, or might have signified to them by a messenger, when the reading of the Law and the Prophets was over, that they waited only for their consent. Indeed, it is almost endless to indulge conjecture in things of such a latitude, which might have happened so many different ways.

§. 3. St. Paul, though educated at the feet of Gamaliel, and an ordained elder or rabbi, was also bred up to a mechanic business, by the exercise of which he not seldom earned his living. He says to the Ephesian elders, *Ye yourselves know, that these*

<sup>e</sup> Acts xiii. 14, 15.

<sup>f</sup> Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 689. Vitruv. de Syn. l. 3. p. 1. c. 7. p. 709, 710.

<sup>g</sup> Vol. 1. p. 611.

*hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me*<sup>h</sup>. And to the Thessalonians, *Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you*<sup>i</sup>. And to the Corinthians the same<sup>k</sup>. We are also informed what this mechanic business was. For St. Paul meeting with Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth, it is said, that *because he was of the same craft, he abode with them, and wrought: for by their occupation they were tentmakers*<sup>l</sup>. However strange this may seem to us, among whom persons that are bred to any learned profession are seldom or never taught any mechanic business, yet was it a thing commonly practised among the Jews. We read that Rabbi Jose was brought up a tanner or leatherdresser, Rabbi Judas a baker<sup>m</sup>, Rabbi Johanan a shoemaker<sup>n</sup>. And Maimonides tells us that some of the greatest of their wise men or rabbies have been hewers of wood and drawers of water<sup>o</sup>. It seems indeed to have been a maxim generally followed by persons of all stations among them, to bring up their children to some trade. This is one of the things said in the Talmud to be commanded a father towards his son, To teach him a trade. And Rabbi Juda says, "He that teaches not his son a trade does as if

<sup>h</sup> Acts xx. 34.

<sup>i</sup> 2 Thess. iii. 8. Vid. et 1 Thess. ii. 9.

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 12.

<sup>l</sup> Acts xviii. 3.

<sup>m</sup> So Drusus translates it. In Lightfoot it is *jailor*, misprinted, I suppose, for *taylor*; for so the word *hajat* signifies. Vid. Buxt. Lex. p. 719, pr.

<sup>n</sup> Drusus in Syn. Crit. in loc. Light. vol. 1. p. 612. n. 3. Vid. et Grot. in loc.

<sup>o</sup> In Talmud torah. Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 612.

“ he taught him to be a thief.” And Rabban Gamaliel says, “ He that has a trade in his hand, to what is he like? He is like to a vineyard that is fenced <sup>p</sup>.” Agreeably hereto, we read in Josephus that Asinæus and Anilæus, who seem to have been Jews of condition in Babylon, were put out by their mother to learn the art of weaving<sup>q</sup>. And it is well known, that at this day the persons educated in the Turkish seraglio, not excluding even the emperors, are instructed in some mechanic trade<sup>r</sup>.

§. 4. St. Paul having in his way to Jerusalem landed at Tyre, and spent some time with the disciples there, when he and his companions departed thence, it is said in the History of the Acts, *They all brought us on our way, with wives and children, till we were out of the city: and we kneeled down on the shore, and prayed*<sup>s</sup>. The more ordinary posture at prayer among the Jews was standing<sup>t</sup>: but in their confessions, supplications, and deprecations, and in times of mourning and affliction, they fell down upon their knees, and bowed their faces to the ground<sup>u</sup>. The great sorrow which affected the Ephesian elders at their parting with St. Paul is expressly related, Acts xx. 36, 37, 38. The Ty-

<sup>p</sup> Tosiphta in Kiddushim. Vid. Light. vol. 1. p. 295, prope fin. Buxt. Lex. p. 120. et Hottinger ad Gemara Chagigah, p. 122.

<sup>q</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 10. §. 1.

<sup>r</sup> Sir Paul Rycaut's Present State of the Ottoman Empire, l. 1. c. 5. <sup>s</sup> Acts xxi. 5. <sup>t</sup> Vid. Light. vol. 2. p. 156.

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Grot. in Matt. vi. 5. Luc. xxii. 41. Eph. iii. 14. Vitruv. de Syn. vet. l. 3. p. 2. c. 16. p. 1072, 1073. The Mahometans change their postures according to the different parts of their prayers, which they seem to have learnt of the Jews. Vid. Reland. de Relig. Mahum. and sir John Chardin's Account of the Religion of the Persians.



rian disciples doubtless were not less deeply afflicted. For the Holy Spirit had made known to them the difficulties and dangers he was to undergo at Jerusalem<sup>x</sup>.

The seashore was esteemed by the Jews a place most pure, and therefore proper to offer up their prayers and thanksgivings to Almighty God. Philo tells us, that the Jews of Alexandria, when Flaccus the governor of Egypt, who had been their great enemy, was arrested by the order of the emperor Caius, not being able to assemble at their synagogues, which had been taken from them, crowded out at the gates of the city early in the morning, went to the neighbouring shores, and standing in a most pure place, with one accord lifted up their voices in praising God<sup>y</sup>. Tertullian says, that the Jews in his time, when they kept their great fast, left their synagogues, and on every shore sent forth their prayers to heaven<sup>z</sup>. And in another place, among the ceremonies used by the Jews, mentions *orationes littorales*, the prayers they made upon the shores<sup>a</sup>. And long before Tertullian's time there was a decree made at Halicarnassus in favour of the Jews, which among other privileges allows them to say their prayers near the shore, according to the

<sup>x</sup> Acts xxi. 4. This I take to be the meaning, comparing the words with ch. xx. 23. The Spirit did not forbid his going, for doubtless then he would not have gone; but the disciples, through the Spirit, foreseeing the great danger his life would be in, were earnest and importunate with him not to go.

<sup>y</sup> In Flac. p. 982, D.

<sup>z</sup> De Jejun. c. 16. n. 103. Relictis templis. Synagogues are also called temples by Josephus. Vid. Vit. de Syn. vet. l. 1. p. 1. c. 4. p. 129.

<sup>a</sup> Adv. Nat. l. 1. c. 13.



custom of their country<sup>b</sup>. It is hence abundantly evident, that it was common with the Jews to choose the shore as a place highly fitting to offer up their prayers. I know the place last recited is otherwise translated by some learned men<sup>c</sup>, who understand the words of the decree as a permission to erect *proseuchæ*, oratories or synagogues, near the sea. And it must be owned the words will well bear that interpretation. But the sense I have given them appears to me full as just and easy<sup>d</sup>, and I think agrees better with what is said by Philo and Tertullian.

It has indeed been the opinion of many learned men, that the Jews chose to build their synagogues on the seashore, or the banks of a river, or near some fountain. To this purpose is alleged that passage, Acts xvi. 13. *And on the sabbath we went out of the city to a river side, where prayer was wont to be made.* Which is translated by them, Where there was by law or custom a *proseucha* or oratory<sup>e</sup>. But it is far from being certain that this is the true meaning of the place<sup>f</sup>. The words may signify nothing more than that the Jews of Philippi

<sup>b</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 14. c. 10. §. 23.

<sup>c</sup> Hudson, and Lardner's Cred. b. 1. ch. 3. p. 226.

<sup>d</sup> Προσευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι, a phrase used 1 Tim. ii. 1. It is true, Halicarnassus was a large city; but can it be supposed, that at the time when this decree was made the Jews were so populous as to need more synagogues than one? In the decree of Sardis, which was also a large city, it is only said, Let there be a place given them in which they may meet with their wives and children. Jos. ibid. §. 24.

<sup>e</sup> Whitby, Drusius, Grot. in loc. Lardner, in his Cred. b. 1. c. 3. p. 225. 229. translates it, Where it had been thought fit that the oratory should be.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Vit. de Syn. vet. l. 1. p. 1. c. 4. p. 124, &c.

were wont to go and offer up their prayers at a certain place by the river side, in the same manner as we have observed other Jews, who lived near the sea, were accustomed to do upon the seashore. Another proof of this opinion is taken from a few lines of the poet Juvenal<sup>g</sup>, which import, that the Jews at Rome were possessed of a place without the gate Capena, where was a fountain, and plenty of water<sup>h</sup>. It is supposed that they chose this situation of their oratories or synagogues for the greater conveniency of washing. For they looked upon themselves as obliged to wash their hands always before they began their prayers<sup>i</sup>, and probably preferred the seawater, if near, to any other<sup>k</sup>.

It is so well known that the hours of prayer in the synagogues were the same with those appointed to offer up the daily sacrifices in the temple<sup>l</sup>, that it is almost needless, I think, to mention to you, that in exact conformity hereto the ninth hour of the day is spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles as the hour of prayer<sup>m</sup>.

§. 5. It is related, that *certain of the Jews banded*

<sup>g</sup> Substituit ad veteres arcus, madidamque Capenam,  
Hic ubi nocturnæ Numa constituebat amicæ:  
Nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur,  
Judæis. SAT. III. 11.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. Fest. Pomp. ad voc. Fontinalia. Vit. de Syn. vet. l. 1. p. 1. c. 11. p. 218. <sup>i</sup> Vit. de Syn. vet. l. 1. p. 1. c. 11. p. 217. et l. 3. p. 2. c. 18. p. 1095. et c. 19. p. 1109. Spencer de Leg. Heb. l. 3. Diss. 3. c. 3. §. 2. p. 1016.

<sup>k</sup> Ὃς δὲ ἔθος ἐστὶ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἀπονιψάμενοι τῇ θαλάσσῃ τὰς χεῖρας, ὡς αὖν ἠϋξάντο πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. Aristieæ Histor. LXX. Inter. p. 34. in Hody, p. 131, prope init. in Havercamp. p. 131, pr.

<sup>l</sup> Vit. de Synag. vet. Proleg. c. 4. p. 42. Seld. de Jure Nat. l. 3. c. 3. p. 287. Light. vol. 2. p. 649. <sup>m</sup> Acts iii. 1. Vid. Grot. et Whitby in loc.

*together, and bound themselves under a curse, saying, that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul*<sup>n</sup>. This is looked upon by the learned Selden as a particular form of excommunication<sup>o</sup>. For it was usual among the Jews for private persons to excommunicate both themselves and others<sup>p</sup>. And it is not improbable that these conspirators laid themselves under all the curses that were wont to be denounced or understood in an excommunication, after the same manner as those of the sect of the Essenes bound themselves by horrid oaths, and under the penalty of excommunication, to observe all the rites peculiar to that sect<sup>q</sup>.

It may seem strange perhaps that these persons should be represented as going to the Jewish magistrates, laying before them the conspiracy they had made, and desiring their assistance in the carrying it on, and this without any discountenance or reprehension from them<sup>r</sup>. But it must be considered, that as St. Paul had no greater enemies than the Sadducees, and that far the greater part of the Jewish magistrates were at this time of that sect, so the method proposed for taking away his life was not inconsistent with the maxims of government held even by the Pharisees. From their perverted oral tradition, and the example of Phinehas, it was made a rule among them, that a private person might kill one who had forsaken the law of Moses. Of this there is the clearest proof, not only in the Talmud<sup>s</sup>,

<sup>n</sup> Acts xxiii. 12.

<sup>o</sup> De Jure Nat. l. 4. c. 7. p. 472. et de

Syned. l. 1. c. 7. p. 857.

<sup>p</sup> Seld. de Jure Nat. l. 4. c. 8.

p. 478. et de Syned. l. 1. c. 7. p. 829, fin. 830.

<sup>q</sup> Jos. de Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 8. §. 7, 8. Vid. Seld. de Syn. l. 1.

c. 7. p. 857, 858.

<sup>r</sup> Acts xxiii. 14, 15.

<sup>s</sup> Sanhed. c. 9. §.

but in Philo<sup>t</sup> and Josephus<sup>u</sup>. It was of the crime of apostasy St. Paul was accused. The Asiatic Jews, when they laid hands on him in the temple, cried out, *Men of Israel, help: This is the man that teacheth all men every where against the people, and the law, and this place.* And they would at that time have put him to death without the form of a trial, had he not been wrested out of their hands by an armed force<sup>x</sup>. There are many examples of this kind to be found in the Jewish writers<sup>y</sup>. It is not in the least to be admired therefore, that the chief priests and elders, who had an inveterate hatred against St. Paul, were far from discountenancing this method of taking away his life, or that they should themselves afterwards determine to execute it<sup>z</sup>.

It may again be thought, that if these conspirators had no apprehensions from their own magistrates, they had just reason to dread the power of the Roman governor; and that it is not to be supposed he would sit still and see public justice thus violated and affronted, and murder committed with impunity. But Josephus informs us, that the

ult. Gemara Bab. ibid. fol. 81, b. et Hieros. cod. tit. fol. 27. col. 2. §. 11. <sup>t</sup> De Sacrificantibus, p. 855, E. de Monarchia, l. 1. p. 818, 819. <sup>u</sup> Antiq. l. 12. c. 6. §. 2. l. 4. c. 8. §. 45. Vid. Grot. de Jure Belli, l. 2. c. 20. §. 9. n. 5. Seld. de Jure Nat. l. 4. c. 4. p. 456, &c. Lardner's Cred. b. 1. ch. 9. p. 459, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Acts xxi. 28, &c.

<sup>y</sup> Under Ptolemy Philopator in Egypt, 3 Mac. vii. 12—15. by Mattathias, 1 Mac. ii. 24, 25, 26. and a number who conspired against Herod, not unlike this conspiracy against St. Paul, Jos. Antiq. l. 15. c. 8. §. 1—4. Vid. et Phil. l. 3. de Vita Mosis, p. 685, b.

<sup>z</sup> Acts xxv. 4.

*sicarii* or private murderers were much encouraged and increased under the government of Felix. For he employing such to assassinate Jonathan the high priest, they went on from that time to despatch whom they pleased without fear<sup>a</sup>. It is not at all surprising therefore that we read of such a combination as this towards the end of his government: and from thenceforwards these *sicarii* or *zelotæ*, for I think Josephus means the same persons by both names, were so multiplied, that they soon destroyed all remains of the people who had any sense of that which is right and good, and then hastened the ruin of the city and temple. It has been asked, What became of these conspirators against St. Paul's life? for, not having accomplished what they vowed, did they neither eat nor drink? We read in the Talmud, that it was as easy to loose as to bind: the same person who laid on the excommunication and curse could also take it off<sup>b</sup>; and particularly with regard to vows of not eating and drinking, any of their rabbies or wise men could absolve them<sup>c</sup>.

§. 6. We read in the Acts of the Apostles of some Jews that were exorcists<sup>d</sup>, that is, persons who by certain adjurations undertook to cast out evil spirits from those who were possessed. It is of the same sort of persons our Saviour speaks in those words, *If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out*<sup>e</sup>? He is there discoursing with the Pharisees, and appeals to those of their disciples (for that is to be understood here by the

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 5. de Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 13. §. 3.

<sup>b</sup> Seld. de Jure Nat. l. 4. c. 8. p. 480, fin. et 481. de Syned. l. 1. p. 867.

<sup>c</sup> Light. vol. 2. p. 703.

<sup>d</sup> Acts xix. 13.

<sup>e</sup> Matt. xii. 27.

word *children*) who were exorcists, whether evil spirits were to be cast out by the assistance of Beelzebub. That there were people of this profession among the Jews, is not only evident from several Christian writers of the second and following ages<sup>f</sup>, but from Josephus, who tells us, that Solomon composed incantations, and left forms of adjurations, by which the evil spirits were so cast out of the possessed as not to return any more; and that this method of cure had been greatly in use from the days of Solomon down to his own time. He gives us also a particular instance of one Eleazar, a Jew, who by this means dispossessed several demoniacs in the presence of the emperor Vespasian, his sons, the chief officers of his army, and a great number of soldiers<sup>g</sup>.

The learned Mr. Joseph Mede says, that “he marvelled how these demoniacs should so abound in and about that nation, which was the people of God, (whereas in other nations, and their writers, we hear of no such,) and that so, as it should seem, about the time of our Saviour’s being on earth only, because in the time before we find no mention of them in scripture. The wonder is yet the greater, because it seems, notwithstanding all this, by the story of the Gospel, not to have been accounted then by the people of the Jews any strange or extraordinary thing, but as a matter usual, nor besides is it taken notice of by any foreign story<sup>h</sup>.” The occasion of this marvelling

<sup>f</sup> Justin. Mar. Dial. cum Tryp. p. 311, C. Iren. l. 2. c. 6. §. 2, pr. et fin. Orig. contra Celsum, l. 1. p. 17. l. 4. p. 183, 184. Epiph. Hær. 30. n. 10.      <sup>g</sup> Antiq. l. 8. c. 2. §. 5. p. 339.

<sup>h</sup> Discourse on John x. 20. Works, p. 28, 29.



is the mistake of some plain facts, which the good man himself in his following discourse sufficiently confutes.

The first mistaken fact is, that demoniacs abounded in the Jewish nation alone; that in other nations, and their writers, we hear of no such. On the contrary, it is certain that they were in other nations, and that they are much spoken of in the ancient Greek and Latin authors, if not always under the very name of demoniacs<sup>i</sup>, yet under several other names, which we know signify the same thing; such as *εὐρυκλείται*<sup>k</sup>, *νυμφόληπτοι*<sup>l</sup>, *θεοφόρητος*<sup>m</sup>,

<sup>i</sup> Yet Aristophanes says, *κακοδαιμονῆς*, thou art mad, thou art possessed. Vid. Plut. act. 2. scen. 3. p. 40. And Socrates in Xenophon uses the word *δαιμονῶν* in the same sense. Vid. Mem. p. 709, C. The word *δαιμονιζομένους*, commonly used in the New Testament, is also found in Thrasyllus de *Ægyptiacis*, (supposed to be the Thrasyllus mentioned by Suetonius, Tacitus, and Dio, as the intimate of the emperor Tiberius :) *Γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῷ λίθος — ποιεῖ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους· ἅμα γὰρ προστεθῆναι ταῖς ῥίσιν, ἀπέρχεται τὸ δαιμόνιον*. Vid. Plut. de Fluviiis, p. 1159. The same passage is quoted by Stobæus. Vid. Maussaci not. ad Plut. Plutarch also uses the same word: *Οἱ μάγοι τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους κελεύουσι τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλέγειν*. Symposiac. l. 7. quæst. 5. prop. fin. et Jos. Ant. l. 8. c. 2. §. 5.

<sup>k</sup> *Οὔτος (Εὐρίκλης) ὡς ἐγγαστρίμυθος λέγεται Ἀθηνήσι ἀληθῆ μαντευόμενος διὰ τοῦ ἐνυπάρχοντος αὐτῷ δαίμονος — ἐγγαστρεῖται δὲ, καὶ εὐρυκλείται ἐκαλοῦντο ἐντεῦθεν πάντες οἱ μαντευόμενοι, ἀπὸ Εὐρυκλέους πρῶτον τοῦτο ποιήσαντος*. Schol. in Aristoph. Vesp. p. 503, pr. Vid. Plat. Sophista, p. 176, E. *Τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους, εὐρυκλέας πάλαι, νυνὶ πύθωνας προσαγορευομένους*. Plut. de Orac. Def. p. 414, E.

<sup>l</sup> Plato in Phæd. p. 1216, E. et *Ὑπὸ τῶν νυμφῶν ἐνθουσιάζω*, p. 1218, F.

<sup>m</sup> *Φρενομανής τις εἶ θεοφόρητος*, spoken of Cassandra, *Æschyl. Agam. v. 1149*. *Πλεῖστον μέντοι τῶν θεοφορήτων πλήθος — ἐν αὐτῇ (Κομάνῃ)*. Strabb, l. 12. p. 535, D.

θεόληπτος<sup>n</sup>, Φοιβόληπτοι<sup>o</sup> πύθωνες<sup>p</sup>, *bacchantes*<sup>q</sup>, *cer-riti*, *larvati*<sup>r</sup>, *lymphatici*<sup>s</sup>, *nocturnis diis*, *Faunisque agitati*<sup>t</sup>. The damsel that had the spirit of divination, spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles, is not called there by the name of a demoniac, notwithstanding St. Paul cast a spirit or demon out of her<sup>u</sup>. And is it not evident, that both the philosophy and theology of the ancient heathen almost necessarily suppose this fact? To what end were their many lustrations<sup>x</sup>? Did not

<sup>n</sup> Plut. de Herod. Malign. p. 855, B. Schol. in Sophoc. Antig. ad v. 975.      <sup>o</sup> Herod. Melpom. §. 13. p. 229.

<sup>p</sup> Plut. de Orac. Def. p. 414, E.

<sup>q</sup> Bacchæ bacchanti si velis advorsarier, Ex insana insaniorem facies. Plaut. Amph. act. 2. scen. 2. v. 71. 'Ἡμῶν δὲ καταγελάτε, ὦ Σκύθαι, ὅτι βακχεύομεν καὶ ἡμέας ὁ θεὸς λαμβάνει· νῦν οὗτος ὁ δαίμων καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον βασιλέα λελάβηκε, καὶ βακχεύει, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαίνεται. Herod. l. 4. c. 79. Παύεσκε μὲν γὰρ ἐνθέους γυναῖκας. Soph. Antig. v. 975. Τὰς θεολήπτους βάρκχας. Schol. ibid. Vid. et Eurip. Bacchæ.

<sup>r</sup> Plaut. Mæn. act. 5. scen. 4. v. 2. Fragn. Amph. v. 5. Cæs. act. 3. scen. 4. v. 2. Merc. act. 5. scen. 4. v. 20. 22. Vid. Aulul. act. 4. scen. 5. v. 15. Larvæ—agitant senem. Captiv. act. 3. scen. 4. v. 66. Larvæ stimulant virum.

<sup>s</sup> Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 25. §. 24. l. 27. §. 83. l. 28. §. 63. l. 34. §. 44. l. 37. §. 12. p. 373, 15. p. 376. Plaut. Pæn. act. 1. scen. 2. v. 132, 133. Vid. Not. ibi Heinsii et Turneb.

<sup>t</sup> Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 30. §. 24.

<sup>u</sup> Acts xvi. 16, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Pythagoras was of the opinion, Εἶναι πάντα τὸν ἀέρα ψυχῶν ἔμπλεων· καὶ τούτους, δαιμονίας τε καὶ ἥρωας νομίζεσθαι· καὶ ὑπὸ τούτων πέμπεσθαι ἀνθρώποις τοὺς ὀνείρους——εἷς τε τούτους γίνεσθαι τοὺς τε καθαρμῶν καὶ ἀποτροπιασμῶν μαντικῇν τε πᾶσαν, &c. Diog. Laert. l. 8. §. 32. Porphyry says, Τὰ μείλιγματα καὶ τὰ τούτων, (φαύλων δαιμόνων) ἀποτρόπαια πρὸς τὸν Πλούτωνα γίνεται. And again, Αἱ ἀγνεῖαι οὐ διὰ τοὺς θεοὺς προηγουμένως, ἀλλ' ἢ οὗτοι (φαύλοι δαίμονες) ἀποστᾶσι. Euseb. Præp. l. 4. c. 23. p. 174. Εἶσω καθαρμῶν, Λοξίου δὲ προσθήγων ἐλευθερόν σε τῶνδε πημάτων κτίσει. Spoken to Orestes, when possessed by the *Furiæ*. Æschyl. Choeph. v. 1059, 1060. Accordingly, when Orestes

Thales<sup>y</sup>, Pythagoras<sup>z</sup>, Heraclitus<sup>a</sup>, Plato, and the Stoics<sup>b</sup> affirm, that all things were full of demons? And are not their priests, in giving forth their oracles, always described as possessed by their gods<sup>c</sup>?

is at Apollo's altar, the *Furiæ* are represented as all fallen asleep. *Æsch. Eumen. v. 46, &c. 94, &c.* Aut te piari jubes, homo insanissime? *Plaut. Men. act. 3. scen. 2. v. 51.* Sos. Quæso quin tu isthanc, jubes pro cerrita circumferri? (*Circumferre verbum pontificale est pro lustrare, et lustratione curare. Scalig. not.*) *Amp. Ædepol, quin factu est opus. Nam hæc quidem ædepol larvarum est plena. Plaut. Amphit. act. 2. v. 144.* Θεόπομπος δὲ ἐν τῇ θ' τῶν φιλιππικῶν, ἄλλα τε πολλὰ περὶ τούτου τοῦ βακχίδος ἱστορεῖ παράδοξα, καὶ ὅτι ποτὲ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων τὰς γυναῖκας μανείσας ἐκάθηρεν. *Schol. in Aristoph. Εἰρήν. p. 703. and Ὀρνιθ. p. 588.* The great Epicurus himself went σὺν τῇ μητρὶ εἰς τὰ οἰκίδια καθαριμὸς ἀναγινώσκειν. *Diog. Laert. l. 10. §. 4.*

<sup>y</sup> Τὸν κόσμον δαιμόνων πλήρη. *Diog. Laert. l. 1. §. 27.*

<sup>z</sup> *Id. l. 8. §. 32.*

<sup>a</sup> Καὶ πάντα ψυχῶν εἶναι καὶ δαιμόνων πλήρη. *Id. l. 9. §. 7.*

<sup>b</sup> *Plat. Conviv. p. 1194, a. Plut. de Plac. Philos. l. 1. c. 8. Vid. et de Orac. Def. p. 415, a, &c. Varron. apud Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 7. c. 6.*

<sup>c</sup> Νῦν δὲ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἡμῖν γίγνεται διὰ μανίας, θεῖα μέντοι δώσει διδομένης· ἥ τε γὰρ δὴ ἐν Δελφοῖς προφητῆτις, αἵ τ' ἐν Δοδώνῃ ἱέρειαι, μανεῖσαι μὲν πολλὰ δὲ καὶ καλὰ——εἰργάσαντο, &c. &c. *Plat. Phædr. p. 1220, C. D. E. Μαντικὴν ἀφροσύνην θεὸς ἀνθρωπίνῃ δέδωκεν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔνους ἐφάπτεται μαντικῆς ἐνθέου καὶ ἀληθοῦς. Id. Tim. p. 1074, D. Τὸ βακχεύσιμον καὶ τὸ μανιῶδες μαντευτικὴν πολλὴν ἔχει. Plut. de Or. Def. p. 432, F. p. 438, a, b. et de Plac. Philos. l. 5. c. 1. Vid. Eurip. Troad. v. 307. 341. 366. 408. 450. 500. Ejusdem Bacchæ, v. 664, &c. 1091, &c. et Act. 5. Virg. Æneid. l. 6. 77—80. Lucan. l. 5. Hi greges (puerorum qui comitantur Apim) repente lymphati futura præcinnunt. *Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 8. §. 71.* The ancients, I am ready to think, looked upon all madmen as agitated by some of their deities. Thus Hercules is represented by Eurip. Herc. Furens, v. 833, &c. Thus Ajax by Sophoc. Aj. Flagell. v. 51. 60. 118. 172. 401. 452, &c. And Orestes by Æschyl. Choep. v. 1053, &c. Eurip. Orest. v. 36. 260, &c. Iphig. in Tauris, v. 285, &c. So when Mænechmus acts the madman, he talks to Bacchus and*

The second mistaken fact is, that demoniacs abounded in the Jewish nation about the time of our Saviour's being on earth only, because in the times before we find no mention of them in scripture. Were it true that there is no mention of any demoniac in the Old Testament, this is no manner of proof that there were none in those times. Is there any mention made there of hydropics, paralytics, or lunatics? Must we conclude therefore that there were no persons in those days labouring under such diseases? Had there been one sent from heaven to heal those distempers in a miraculous manner, as our Saviour did, no doubt we should have found

Apollo, Bromie, quo me in sylvam venatum vocas? Multa mihi imperas, Apollo. Ecce, Apollo, denuo me jubes facere impetum. *Plaut. Mæn. act. 5. scen. 2. v. 82. 109. 115.* The argument which seems to me to have prevailed with the generality of the moderns in their laying aside this opinion, is, that madness oftentimes yields to medicine. But this had no weight with the ancients; for they were fully persuaded, that as possessions were to be obtained by the use of certain waters or herbs, so they might be delivered from them by medicines: 'Η δὲ γῆ πολλῶν μὲν ἄλλων δυνάμεων πηγὰς ἀνίησιν ἀνθρώποις, τὰς μὲν ἐκστατικὰς—τὰς δὲ χρηστὰς—τὸ δὲ μαντικόν, ῥεύμα καὶ πνεῦμα θεϊστατόν ἐστι καὶ ὀσιώτατον, ἂν τε καθ' ἑαυτὸν δι' ἄερος, ἂν τε μεθ' ὑγροῦ νάματος ἀφαιρῇται. *Plut. de Orac. Def. p. 432, D.* Sed ibi (Phrygiæ Gallo flumine) in potando necessarius modus, ne lymphatos agat: quod in Æthiopia accidere his, qui e fonte rubro biberint, Ctesias scribit. *Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 31. §. 5.* Thalassegle pota lymphari homines, obversantibus miraculis.—Theangelida pota magi divinent. *Id. l. 24. §. 95. p. 360.* And that the possessed might be cured, vid. *Plaut. Mæn. act. 5. scen. 4.* Joseph. *Antiq. l. 8. c. 2. §. 5. p. 339.* de Bell. l. 7. c. 6. §. 3. Tobit, ch. vi. and viii. *Plut. de Fluv. p. 1159.* The same virtue is also ascribed to this stone, which grows in the river Nile, by Aristotle, or whoever was the author of the book de Mirabil. Συντελεῖ δὲ καὶ ταῖς δαίμονι τιμὴν γενομένοις κατόχοις, ἅμα γὰρ τῇ προσθῆναι ταῖς ῥίσιν, ἀπέρχεται τὸ δαιμόνιον. Vid. *Maussaci Not. ad Plut. Fluv. Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 25. §. 24. l. 27. §. 83. l. 30. §. 24. l. 37. §. 12. 15.*

that there were as many under the Old Testament as under the New. But there having been no such occasion given for the speaking of them, can we wonder that we read not of many of them? However, it is not true that there is no mention made of demoniacs in the Old Testament, if the thing, and not the word, be hereby meant. For it is said that Saul, the first king of Israel, was troubled with an evil spirit<sup>d</sup>, that is, was a demoniac. And it is evident, from the words of Josephus I have already referred to, that demoniacs were frequent among them from that time downward. For he expressly says, that the method of cure instituted by king Solomon very much prevailed in the Jewish nation even down to his own time<sup>e</sup>. And whereas Mr. Mede says, that demoniacs abounded in the Jewish nation about the time of our Saviour's being on earth only, there is nothing more known, than that almost all writers for two or three centuries after, not only Christians, but such as were the greatest enemies the Christians ever had, mention them as no unusual thing in their time, and in other countries than Judæa<sup>f</sup>. It is an

<sup>d</sup> 1 Sam. xvi. 14. 16.

<sup>e</sup> Καὶ αὕτη μέχρι νῦν παρ' ἡμῶν ἡ θεραπεία πλεῖστον ἰσχύει. Antiq. l. 8. c. 2. §. 5.

<sup>f</sup> Plut. Sympos. l. 7. qu. 5. prope fin. Δαίμονας ἀνάγων. Luc. Philopseud. p. 474, E. "Οσοι τοῖς δαιμονῶντας ἀπαλλάττουσι τῶν δειμάτων. Ibid. p. 477, D. et 478, A. B. Apollonius relates, that a woman came to the Brachmans, praying relief for her son, who was sixteen years of age, δαιμονῶν δὲ δύο ἔτη, and had been a demoniac two years. Philostr. de Vit. Apol. l. 3. c. 12. p. 144, 145. Apollonius was himself taken for a demoniac by the hierophant at Athens. Ibid. l. 4. c. 6. p. 175. 'Ο δαίμων ἐλαίνει σε οὐκ εἰδὼτα' ἐκλήθει δὲ ἄρα δαιμονῶν τὸ μεράκειον. And Apollonius cast out the demon, making him throw down a statue at parting, as an evidence that he had left him. Ibid. p. 176, 177. Celsus in Orig. p. 333. 416. 417. Porph. de Abstin. l. 2. §. 43, fin. 46, fin. 47,



unhappiness, that when learned men, through forgetfulness or inadvertency, or through a desire of being better informed, drop a doubt in their writings concerning any particular passage of scripture, the half-learned and the half-thinking eagerly catch it up, and insist upon it as an irrefragable argument against the truth of the sacred writings. I will be bold to say, that five-sixths of the objections against the Christian religion, which have of late been industriously spread, are of this kind.

Circumcision<sup>g</sup>; resting on the seventh day<sup>h</sup>; keeping fasts<sup>i</sup> and feasts<sup>k</sup>; eating at some times

fin. The remains we have of Porphyry and Jamblichus contain not a little on the subject of demons. It is certain also, that the doctrine concerning demons was one article in the theology of the Platonists, as may be seen in the works of Plato, Plutarch, Plotinus, Maximus Tyrius, Alcinous, Apuleius, Proclus, Julian, and Eusebius in *Præp.* l. 4. c. 5. And it appears plainly to have been Lucian's intention in writing his *Philopseudes* to ridicule the grave philosophers in and near his own time; for that their writings and discourses were so filled with demons, demoniacs, apparitions, and magical operations. Compare what he says with *Philostr. de Vita Apoll.* l. 4. c. 15. p. 205, A. B. c. 3. p. 165. c. 8. p. 182, 183, 184. l. 6. c. 16. p. 303, 304. l. 8. c. 3. p. 395, B. D. and c. 5. p. 411, C.

<sup>g</sup> Acts vii. 8. x. 45. xi. 2. and xv. 1. Vid. *Hor.* l. 1. Sat. 5. v. 100. et Sat. 9. v. 70. *Catull.* 45. *Juv.* Sat. 14. v. 99. 103. *Pers.* Sat. 5. v. 184. *Mart.* l. 7. 29. 88. *Strab.* l. 16. p. 761, C. et p. 824, B. *Tacit. Hist.* l. 5. §. 5. *Suet. Dom.* c. 12. n. 6.

<sup>h</sup> Acts xiii. 14. 27. 42. xv. 21. xvii. 2. and xviii. 4. Vid. *Hor.* l. 1. Sat. 9. v. 69. *Juv.* Sat. 6. v. 158. Sat. 14. v. 96. 105. 106. *Pers.* Sat. 5. v. 184. *Tac. Hist.* l. 5. p. 353. l. 4. *Dio.* l. 36. p. 36. E. p. 37, C. D. *Plut. Symp.* l. 4. qu. 5. p. 671, F. 672, A. et de *Superstit.* p. 169, C. *Justin.* l. 36. c. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Acts xiii. 2. and xxvii. 9. Vid. *Tac. Hist.* l. 5. §. 4. p. 353. l. 2. *Suet. Aug.* c. 76. n. 3. *Mart.* l. 4. 4. *Strabo.* l. 16. p. 761, C. et 763, A. *Plut. Symp.* l. 4. qu. 5. p. 671, D. *Just.* l. 36. c. 2.

<sup>k</sup> Acts xviii. 21. Vid. *Juv.* Sat. 6. v. 158. *Pers.* Sat. 5. v. 180, &c. *Plut. Symp.* l. 4. qu. 5. p. 671, D. E. et 672, A.



unleavened bread<sup>l</sup>; making a distinction of meats<sup>m</sup>; separating themselves from the society of other people<sup>n</sup>; rejecting all images<sup>o</sup>; worshipping the God of heaven alone<sup>p</sup>; permitting none but Jews to enter the temple at Jerusalem<sup>q</sup>; burying their dead<sup>r</sup>; together with their firm adherence to Moses their lawgiver<sup>s</sup>; are customs indeed plainly hinted in the Acts of the Apostles; but are so well known to have belonged to the Jews, that they need not any long and laborious confirmation.

<sup>l</sup> Acts xx. 6. Vid. Tac. Hist. l. 5. p. 353. l. 3. Raptarum frugum argumentum, panis Judaicus nullo fermento, retinet.

<sup>m</sup> Acts x. 14. Vid. Tac. Hist. l. 5. §. 4. p. 353. n. 1. Juv. Sat. 14. v. 98. et Sat. 6. v. 159. Plut. Symp. l. 4. qu. 5.

<sup>n</sup> Acts x. 28. xi. 3. and xvi. 20, 21. Vid. Juv. Sat. 14. v. 100. 103. 104. Tac. Hist. l. 5. §. 4. l. 2. Separati epulis, discreti cubilibus, §. 5. l. 3. Κεχωρίδαται δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων—τὰ περὶ τὴν δίσαιταν πάνθ' ὡς εἰπεῖν. Dio, l. 36. p. 37, B. C. Just. l. 36. c. 2. n. 28.

<sup>o</sup> Acts xvii. 29. and xix. 26. Vid. Tac. Hist. l. 5. p. 353. l. ult. Nulla simulachra urbibus suis, nedum templis sunt. Non regibus hæc adulatio, non Cæsaribus honor, p. 354. n. 5, 6. et p. 359. l. 2. Οὐδ' ἄγαλμα οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτοῖς ποτὲ τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἔσχον. Dio, l. 36. p. 37, C. Strabo, l. 16. p. 760, D. 761, A.

<sup>p</sup> Acts xiv. 15. and xvii. 24. Vid. Juv. Sat. 14. v. 97. Strabo, l. 16. p. 761, A. Tac. Hist. l. 5. p. 354. n. 5. Dio, l. 36. p. 37, C.

<sup>q</sup> Acts xxi. 28, 29. and xxiv. 6. Vid. Tac. Hist. l. 5. p. 357. l. ult. Illic, immensæ opulentiae templum;—ad fores tantum Judæo aditus; limine præter sacerdotes arcebantur. Jos. Antiq. l. 15. c. 11. §. 5, prop. fin. et l. 8. c. 3. §. 9. and the speech of Titus, de Bell. l. 6. c. 2. §. 4.

<sup>r</sup> Acts ii. 29. and v. 6. 10. Vid. Tacit. Hist. l. 5. p. 354. n. 3. Corpora condere, quam cremare e more Ægyptio.

<sup>s</sup> Acts vi. 11. 13. 14. and xxi. 21. 28. Vid. Juv. Sat. 14. v. 101, 102. Tac. Hist. l. 5. §. 4.

## CHAP. VIII.

*Grecian customs confirmed.*

§. 1. I HAVE now, I think, considered all the customs referred to in the History of the Acts which are purely Jewish. There remains one which is common to the Jews with most other nations, and that is the practice of magic. We read of Bar Jesus a Jew, who was a sorcerer<sup>a</sup>, and of Simon a sorcerer in Samaria<sup>b</sup>, and *that many of the Christian converts at Ephesus, who had used curious arts, brought their books together, and burnt them before all men*<sup>c</sup>. Nothing is more certain than that the arts of sorcery or magic were expressly forbidden by the law of Moses<sup>d</sup>. Notwithstanding, it is a very clear fact that they were practised by many among the Jews as well as among the heathen: if any credit may be given to the Talmud, twenty-four of the school of Rabbi Judah were killed by sorcery<sup>e</sup>, eighty women sorceresses were hanged in one day by Simon Ben Shetah<sup>f</sup>. And the gloss says, the women of Israel were generally fallen to the practice of sorceries. So greatly did the practice hereof abound among them, that a skill in this art was re-

<sup>a</sup> Acts xiii. 6.<sup>b</sup> Acts viii. 9.<sup>c</sup> Acts xix. 19.

<sup>d</sup> Exod. xxii. 18. Lev. xx. 27. Deut. xviii. 10, 11. 1 Sam. xxviii. 3. 9. Mishna Sanhed. c. 7. §. 4. Maim. in tract. Sanh. et Abodah Zara, c. 6. More Neboch. p. 3. c. 37. Seld. de Jur. Nat. l. 2. c. 1. p. 172. et cap. 7. p. 228. et l. 7. c. 3. p. 718, et 719. de Syned. l. 2. c. 13. §. 5.

<sup>e</sup> Light. vol. 1. p. 371. vol. 2. p. 244. Hieros. Talm. fol. 18. col. 3.

<sup>f</sup> Hieros. Sanh. fol. 23. 3. Bab. Sanh. fol. 44. 2. See Light. vol. 2. p. 244.

quired as a necessary qualification for a person to be chosen into their councils, whether that of seventy-one or those of twenty-three, that he might be the better able to try and judge the accused, whether they were really guilty of this wicked art or not<sup>g</sup>. Nay, several of their elders, judges, or rabbies, arrived at so great a proficiency herein, that they outdid them who made it their profession<sup>h</sup>. We read also in Josephus, of one Simon a Jew, born in Cyprus, a sorcerer, who was a great friend and companion of Felix the Roman governor<sup>i</sup>, in the same manner as Bar Jesus, mentioned in the Acts, seems to have been of Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus. The same author tells us, that at that time were very many sorcerers and deceivers, who, pretending to shew wonders and prodigies, seduced great numbers of people after them into the wilderness<sup>k</sup>.

That magic was practised among the heathen is a thing too well known to need any proof. Their philosophers, historians, and poets, agree to confirm this fact<sup>l</sup>. Nay, several of the most renowned of

<sup>g</sup> Rabbi Jochanan in Gem. Bab. ad tit. Sanh. c. 1. fol. 17. 1. et ad tit. Menachoth, c. 6. fol. 65. 1. et Maim. Halach, Sanh. c. 2. §. 1. See Seld. de Syn. l. 2. c. 9. p. 1412, 1413. et Light. vol. 2. p. 244.

<sup>h</sup> Thus did Rabbi Meer Hier. Sotah, fol. 16, 2. et Rabbi Joshua Hierus. Sanh. fol. 25. 4. See Light. vol. 1. p. 371. et vol. 2. p. 244.

<sup>i</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 7. §. 2. Thus Thrasyllus the sorcerer was one of the most intimate friends of the emperor Tiberius. Tacit. Ann. l. 6. c. 21, fin. Suet. in Aug. 99. 3. et in Tib. 14. 7. Dio, l. 55. p. 555.

<sup>k</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 6. et de Bell. l. 2. c. 13. §. 4. *στῆφος πο-  
νηρῶν*.

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Del Rio et Bulenger de Magia. Tibul. l. 2. 45. Hor. Sat. 8. Silius Ital. l. 13. Noris, vol. 3. p. 603. Ovid, &c.

the Greek philosophers were themselves at no small pains to attain a skill in this art, such as Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, Plato<sup>m</sup>. And it deserves remarking, that as Simon is said in the Acts of the Apostles *to have given out himself to have been some great one*, that is, as the ancients interpret it to be, the Deity<sup>n</sup>, so Pythagoras gave out that he was Apollo Hyperboreus<sup>o</sup>. That there were many conversant in the art of magic in the city of Rome during the reigns of Augustus, Tiberius, and many succeeding emperors, is abundantly evident from the Roman history; and we read of their having been banished Italy more than once<sup>p</sup>. Ephesus, which is the place where it is said the Christian converts brought together and burnt their books of sorcery,

<sup>m</sup> Certe Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, Plato, ad hanc discendam navigavere, exiliis verius quam peregrinationibus susceptis. Hanc reversi prædicavere; hanc in arcanis habuere. *Plin. Nat. Hist.* l. 30. §. 2. *Diog. Laert.* l. 8, 24, pr. et 59, pr. Philostratus would clear them of this. See *De Vita Apoll.* l. 1. c. 1. but it is too plain a fact to be denied.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Grot. in Act. viii. 10.

<sup>o</sup> This he did by shewing his golden or ivory thigh. Vid. *Porph. Vit. Pyth.* p. 192, 193. *Jamb. de Vit. Pyth.* c. 28. p. 127. 131. *Orig. contr. Cels.* l. 6. p. 280. *Ælian.* l. 2. c. 26. et l. 4. c. 17. et *Diog. Laert.* l. 8. 11. How shall we reconcile this with his metempsychosis, and with his conversing with Apollo? *Philostrat.* ubi supra.

<sup>p</sup> *Tacit. Ann.* l. 2. §. 27. Ut infernas umbras carminibus eliceret. §. 28. et 69. l. 16. §. 30. Quin et facto per magos sacro, evocare manes et exorare tentavit. *Suet. Ner.* c. 34. n. 11. Vid. et *Plin. Nat. Hist.* l. 30. §. 5. They were expelled, an. U. C. 614. *Valer.* l. 1. c. 3. §. 2. Again, 721. *Dio,* l. 49, fin. Were forbid all prophesying, 761. *Dio,* l. 56. And were again banished Italy under Tiberius, 770. So that Tacitus says of them, Genus hominum, quod in civitate nostra et vetabitur semper et retinebitur. *Ann.* l. 2. §. 32. *Hist.* l. 1. §. 22. et l. 2. §. 62.

was so famous for this art, that some particular forms of enchantment derived their names from thence<sup>q</sup>, either as having been originally invented by some magician of that city, or as being most in use among the Ephesians. I have sometimes thought, that the notions which prevailed concerning the power of magic were no small hinderance to the progress of Christianity. It is very certain that the enemies of the gospel, both Jews and heathens, ascribed the miraculous works wrought by our Saviour and his apostles to this power<sup>r</sup>, and no doubt prevailed with many to be of the same opinion. But is it possible, that those who looked upon the works performed to proceed from no higher an original, could conceive them to be any proof of a mission from the one only living and true God, or of the truth and certainty of the doctrines taught by the performers?

§. 2. It is said in the Acts, that *a certain damsel, possessed with a spirit of divination, brought her masters much gain by soothsaying*; and that Paul dispossessed her by commanding the spirit *in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her*<sup>s</sup>. The words, which are here properly enough translated *a spirit of divination*, are πνεῦμα πύθωνος. There was a famous temple at Delphi erected to the honour of Apollo, who from killing one, who for his cruelty was surnamed Python, that is, serpent or dragon,

<sup>q</sup> Plut. Sympos. l. 7. 9. 5. fin. Vid. verba Menandri, Athenæi, Clem. Alex. citata Grotio in Act. xix. 19. et Suid. in voc. Ἐφεσ. γραμ. <sup>r</sup> Matt. ix. 34. Talmud Bab. Schab. fol. 104. 2. Sanhed. fol. 107. 2. See Light. vol. 2. p. 189. Celsus in Orig. l. 1. p. 7. 22. 24. et 53. Vid. Not. Spenc. in Orig. p. 7. col. 1.

<sup>s</sup> Ch. xvi. 16. 18.

had the name of Pythius given him<sup>t</sup>. The person who gave forth oracles at this temple was a woman called Pythia, supposed to be inspired and possessed by Pythius or Apollo<sup>u</sup>. When she uttered the oracle her mouth was shut, and the voice came as from her belly or breast<sup>x</sup>, and it was understood to be Apollo who spoke in her<sup>y</sup>. There were many persons of both sexes in other places, who seemed to be inspired or possessed in the same manner, whose voices proceeded from the same parts of the body<sup>z</sup>, and who were thought to divine or tell things future. These persons were called Pythons<sup>a</sup>, and the spirit which spake within them was called the spirit of Python<sup>b</sup>, probably because of the same kind which inspired the priestess of Python or Delphi; for Python was also another name for Delphi<sup>c</sup>.

A late writer, who seems unwilling to believe that there ever were any persons possessed by de-

<sup>t</sup> Strabo, l. 9. p. 422, 423. Macrob. Sat. l. 1. c. 17. p. 281. Basnage, Ann. 51. p. 625. n. 16. Bochart. Hieroz. p. 2. l. 3. c. 5. p. 383. Potter's Greek Antiq. b. 2. ch. 9.

<sup>u</sup> Strabo, l. 9. p. 419, B. Τὴν Πυθίαν δεχομένην τὸ πνεῦμα. Vid. et Orig. adv. Cels. p. 333.

<sup>x</sup> Potter's Greek Antiq. b. 2. c. 9. p. 246. and ch. 12. p. 268, Galen in Glossis. Hippoc. cit. Grot. in Act. xvi. 16. Hammond. in loc.

<sup>y</sup> Orig. adv. Cels. l. 2. p. 63. l. 3. p. 125. Schol. in Aristoph. Plut. p. 6. col. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Judæi dicunt vocem esse emissam a partibus quæ nominari non debent. Vid. Seld. de diis Syris, Syntag. 1. c. 3. p. 289. Menoch. in Syn. Crit. ad 1 Sam. xxviii. 7.

<sup>a</sup> Plut. de Orac. Defect. p. 414, E.

<sup>b</sup> Suid. in voc. Πύθωνος. Schol. in Aristoph. Plut. p. 6. Potter's Greek Antiq. b. 2. c. 12. p. 268, 269.

<sup>c</sup> Homer. B. l. 519. et Schol. ibi. Pindar. Olymp. od. 6. Calim. Hym. in Apoll. v. 35. et in Delium, v. 90. et in Dian. v. 250.



mons or evil spirits, says of the damsel who had a spirit of divination, that “when she was discovered, “she was disabled from playing this trick any “longer. By St. Paul’s saying to her, *I command “thee to come out of her*, no more was or could be “meant than to put a stop to the trick the woman “used<sup>d</sup>.” Now, supposing this woman’s speaking inwardly, as from her belly or breast, were a trick of her own acquiring, and noways owing to any demon or spirit that spake from within her, this author should have shewn how St. Paul’s saying those words, *I command thee to come out of her*, was a discovery of this trick. I believe all his readers, as well as myself, must be utterly at a loss to know how the pronouncing those words could any ways reveal the secret, and convince the by-standers that she was a mere impostor, and had no spirit of divination within her: would it not rather convince them, that in his opinion she had such a spirit within her? But let us again suppose, what is not so much as hinted in the text, that St. Paul spent much time in talking to the people, and shewing them, that this woman, by a particular formation of the organs of speech, and by long practice, had gained a habit of speaking so as that no one should see her lips move, and the voice should seem to come from her breast. I am yet at a loss to know how this could deprive her masters of their gain: for surely this would go but a little way towards convincing the people that she could not really predict things future. Her reputation was established; there was a general belief that she did foretell things,

<sup>d</sup> Inquiry into the Meaning of Demons, p. 54.

and a great concourse of people after her to make inquiry into their future fortunes. It is expressly said that *she brought her masters much gain by soothsaying*. The shewing that it was possible for her by long practice to attain the art of speaking inwardly, would noways dissuade persons from following her, so long as they retained a notion that she really prophesied.

We will advance therefore one step further, and suppose that St. Paul spent time not only in discovering the trick of speaking inwardly, but that he also argued against her being a diviner or prophetess, and plainly laid before them, that she usually made her answers in ambiguous and general terms, that they much oftener proved false than true, and that it was owing to mere accident, if at any time there seemed to be truth in what she had said. If we judge from the experience we have of mankind, we cannot reasonably suppose that these arguments should immediately prevail with all the by-standers, or indeed any considerable part of them, to lay aside the opinion they had entertained of this woman's gift. However, we will suppose that all the by-standers were at once convinced of the truth and weight of the apostle's arguments: would they be able immediately to spread the same persuasion among all the inhabitants of Philippi? And if all Philippi had believed her an impostor, might not her masters have sent her to another city, where, by the practice of the same arts, she might still have brought them much gain? The plain truth therefore is, St. Paul prevented her future prophesying; or, if the word *trick* pleases better, he wholly disabled her from doing the trick any more. He cast

out the spirit which spake within her, so that she was no more heard to speak as from her belly or breast. Her masters soon perceived that she was no longer inspired or possessed, that she could now utter no more divinations or prophecies; and therefore all hope of their gains from her, whether in Philippi, or any other city, were wholly gone<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>c</sup> After all, it is a dispute among learned men, whether this woman was of the number of ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, whether she did speak inwardly as from her belly or breast. They say the words ἔχουσιν πνεῦμα πίθωνος do not necessarily imply this meaning, but only in general, that she was possessed by a spirit of divination, or foretelling things to come. And they urge, that when she followed St. Paul, and said, *These men are the servants of the most high God, which shew unto us the way of salvation*, ἔκραζε, she spake out with a loud and distinct voice. If this were the case, what trick had the woman that St. Paul could discover to the people? Vid. Wolfi Cur. in loc. Another thing which demonstrates the absurdity of this interpretation is the rage of the multitude against St. Paul. For no sooner had the masters of the girl accused him and Silas to the magistrates, but it is said, *that the multitude rose up together against them*, v. 22. Had he, as this interpreter supposes him to have done, convinced the whole city of Philippi that this maidservant was an impostor, and could foretell things future no more than any other person, no doubt they would have taken part with St. Paul, and not with the masters of the girl. They would have thought themselves obliged to him for having discovered the cheat, and preventing their future expense in needless and fruitless applications to one who could only amuse and deceive them, but not foretell them any thing future. If they were incensed against any person, it is natural to suppose it should have been against the girl and her masters, for having imposed upon them, and tricked them out of their money. But that they should take part with the masters of this impostor against the person who had discovered the fraud, is so contrary to all the experience we have of mankind, that it is a demonstration of the absurdity of this comment. On the other hand, if we take the story in the plain and literal sense, how natural is

And although this affair of possessions is esteemed so great a difficulty by many of our modern reasoners and pretenders to philosophy, and can by no means gain their assent, yet is it very certain, that not a few of the gravest and wisest of the ancient philosophers were fully persuaded of its truth. Van Dalen himself acknowledges that the Pythagoreans and Platonists believed it<sup>f</sup>; and indeed it appears too plainly from their writings to be denied. It sufficiently appears also, that the belief hereof was not confined to these two sects, but that many other philosophers were of the same opinion<sup>g</sup>. Most of

it that the multitude of the city should side with the masters, as being fully persuaded, that it was not only a great piece of injustice done to them by the apostle, but a public injury of a very heinous nature, they having hereby lost what they esteemed an oracle, to which they might apply upon all urgent and doubtful occasions! Nor is there any the least hint in the text of a change in the multitude, as though they had been first for St. Paul, and afterwards, by some secret management, brought over to side with the masters.

<sup>f</sup> De Orac. p. 185. ed. 1683.

<sup>g</sup> Zeno, and the whole sect of the Stoics; Aristotle, and a great number of the Peripatetics. Καὶ μὴν καὶ μαντικὴν ὑφεστάναι πᾶσαν φασιν, ἥ καὶ πρόνοιαν εἶναι, spoken of Zeno and the Stoics. Diog. Laër. l. 7. §. 149. Οἱ Στωικοὶ τὴν μαντικὴν εἰσάγουσι κατὰ τὸ ἔνθεον, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐνθουσιαστικόν.—Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Δικαίάρχος τὸ κατ' ἐνθουσιασμόν μόνον παρεισάγουσι, καὶ τοῖς ὀνείροις. Plut. de Plac. Philos. l. 5. c. 1. Colophonius Xenophanes, unus, qui deos esse diceret, divinationem funditus sustulit, reliqui vero omnes præter Epicurum divinationem probaverunt—Dicæarchus Peripateticus cætera divinationis genera sustulit, somniorum et furoris reliquit. —Sed cum Stoici omnia fere illa defenderent, quod et Zeno in suis Commentariis quasi semina quædam sparsisset, et ea Cleanthes paulo uberiora fecisset; accessit acerrimo vir ingenio Chrysippus, qui totam de Divinatione duobus libris explicavit sententiam, uno præterea de oraculis, uno de somniis: quem subse-

the philosophers who lived after our Saviour's time were strong in the persuasion hereof<sup>h</sup>, even those who were the greatest enemies the Christians ever had, such as Apollonius<sup>i</sup> and Porphyry<sup>k</sup>. Celsus himself, in disputing against the Christian religion, lays aside the Epicurean, and supposes the truth hereof<sup>l</sup>. I think also it may be made very evident, that the Christians of the first ages knew well how to distinguish between the craft, artifices, and frauds of the heathen priests and real possessions<sup>m</sup>.

§. 3. We read in the Acts of Demetrius, a silver-smith, which made silver shrines for Diana<sup>n</sup>. That Diana was esteemed a goddess, that she was worshipped, not in Asia Minor alone, but throughout the then known world, as Demetrius asserteth<sup>o</sup>, and

quens, unum librum Babylonius Diogenes edidit, ejus auditor : duo Antipater : quinque noster Posidonius. *Tull. de Divin.* l. 1. §. 5, 6. Vid. et §. 82—88. Dixi de Pythagora, de Democrito, de Socrate : Excepi de antiquis, præter Xenophanem, neminem ; adjunxi veterem academiam, Peripateticos, Stoicos : unus dissentit Epicurus. §. 87.

<sup>h</sup> As fully appears by their remaining works, and is set in a glaring light by Lucian in his *Philopseud*.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Philostr. de Vit. Apoll.

<sup>k</sup> Porphyry wrote a book *Περὶ τῆς ἐκ λόγιων φιλοσοφίας*, *De Philosophia ex Oraculis*, in which he made a collection of the oracular answers given by Apollo and the other gods and good demons, thinking this a sufficient proof of the goodness and efficacy of theology, and a fit incitement to the study of divine wisdom. Euseb. *Præp.* l. 4. c. 6.

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Orig. adv. Cels. p. 333. 416. 420.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. p. 333. Euseb. *Præp.* l. 4. c. 1, 2, 3. Lucian's *Pseudomantis* drives out the Christians before he begins to shew his tricks, quoted by Vandale, de *Orac.* p. 441. and Vandale's own words, p. 443. n. 6. ed. 1683.

<sup>n</sup> Chap. xix. 24. *ναυπιός*. Vid. Schol. in Aristot. *Rhet.* l. 1. c. 15.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Herod. *Euterp.* l. 2. c. 137. Pausan. *Messen.* p. 141. l.



that she had a most magnificent temple erected at Ephesus<sup>p</sup>, are things confirmed by so many authors, and so well known, that it would be a needless expense of your time to relate the particular passages. The word which we translate *shrines* is in the Greek *ναοὺς*, *temples*. That it was the custom with the Greeks and other heathen nations to make little models of a temple, and place a small image therein, in order to carry with them when they travelled or went to war<sup>q</sup>, as also for their private devotion at home, is confirmed to us by a variety of ancient authors<sup>r</sup>: and indeed the making such temples continues to be the custom in some of the more polite heathen nations to this day. A very curious one of this sort I have seen brought hither from the East

33. et ubique Strabo ubique Seld. de Diis Syris Syntag. c. 8. p. 385. et c. 13. p. 395. Tac. Ann. l. 3. §. 61, 62. Liv. l. 1. c. 45. Eurip. Iphig. in Tauris. Ulpian. Instit. tit. 22. §. 6.

<sup>p</sup> Strabo, l. 14. p. 640, 641. Pausan. Achaic. p. 207. l. 9, &c. Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 36. c. 14. or §. 21. Solin. c. 40. Ἡτ' Ἐφέσου πάγχρυσον ἔχεις οἶκον. Aristoph. Neph. p. 162. Xen. de Exped. Cyri, l. 5. p. 350. Martial. de Spectac. ep. 1. Pompon. Mela, l. 1. c. 17. Philo Byzant. de Septem, Orbis Spectac. et Allatici Not. p. 91. Vid. Wolfii Cur. in loc. et Basn. An. p. 672.

<sup>q</sup> Asclepiades philosophus—deæ cœlestis argenteum breve figmentum, quocunque ibat, secum solitus efferre. *Amm. Marcel.* l. 22. c. 13. Dio informs us, that the famous Roman eagle, or ensign so called, was a little temple, in which was placed a golden eagle. L. 40. p. 128, D. And Salmasius thinks this is plainly to be seen upon Trajan's pillar. Exercit. in Solin. p. 802. and Stewechius, in a coin of Constantine's. Comment. ad Veget. l. 2. c. 6. p. 119, fin. 2 Sam. v. 21. 1 Chron. xiv. 12. Virg. Æneid. l. 8. v. 678, &c. Tacit. Ann. l. 15. 29. Vid. Sanctii Com. in 4. lib. Reg. p. 105. et 603. et Spenc. de Leg. Heb. p. 816.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Herod. l. 2. p. 113. l. 45. Polyb. l. 6. p. 495, C. Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 36. §. 4. n. 5. 10. et §. 19. n. 2.



Indies. That there should be a great demand for the models of so famous a temple as that at Ephesus, which was esteemed one of the wonders of the world, so as to create much trade to the workmen employed in making them, is but an easy and natural supposition. Demetrius made a speech to the workmen, which being finished, they cried out, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*<sup>s</sup>!

Afterwards, the whole city being gathered together, are represented as making the same cry<sup>t</sup>. That it was customary with the Greeks to make such acclamations in honour of their gods is evident from a passage of Aristides, who represents the people of Smyrna as shouting in the same manner, Great is Æsculapius<sup>u</sup>!

§. 4. The people of Ephesus, having caught Gaius and Aristarchus, Paul's companions, rushed with one accord into the theatre, and Paul also would have entered in; but it is said, that *certain of the chief of Asia, which were Paul's friends, sent unto him, desiring him that he would not adventure himself into the theatre*<sup>x</sup>. What we translate *certain of the chief of Asia*, is in the Greek τινὲς δὲ τῶν Ἀσιαρχῶν,

<sup>s</sup> Ver. 28.

<sup>t</sup> Ver. 34.

<sup>u</sup> Serm. Sacr. 2. p. 520. The learned Ez. Spauheim understands it of the people of Pergamus. De Præst. Numis. p. 424. And it is certain there was a very ancient temple of Æsculapius at Pergamus. Vid. Tac. Ann. l. 3. c. 63. But it is plain, from the foregoing words of Aristides, that this affair was transacted at Smyrna. Vid. p. 519, A. There was a temple of Æsculapius also at Smyrna. Vid. Serm. Sacr. 1. p. 486, A. It was in or near that city likewise, if I mistake not, that Aristides made that acclamation in his dream, Great is Æsculapius! p. 514, C. Vid. etiam Elsner. in loc.

<sup>x</sup> Ver. 29, 30, 31.

*certain of the Asiarchs*, that is, principal officers or high priests chosen by the community of Asia to preside over their feasts and games, which were performed at certain intervals to the honour of their gods<sup>y</sup>. The temple of Diana at Ephesus was built at the common expense of all the Grecian cities in Asia<sup>z</sup>: and it is probable, that the temples erected to other deities in some other cities were built in the same manner. Near these temples were exhibited public games after a certain term of years<sup>a</sup>, and Asiarchs were chosen by the common suffrage of all the Grecian cities<sup>b</sup> in Asia to preside over these games, and to perform the honours due to the deity. It is, I think, evident, from the relation in the Acts, that they were then celebrating the games we are speaking of at Ephesus<sup>c</sup>. Upon this account the Asiarchs were there present. For this reason the people rushed into the theatre. It was in this great concourse of people that Demetrius expected a brisk trade, which, perhaps, not wholly answering his expectation, he might think that St. Paul, who had now preached more than two years at Ephesus<sup>d</sup> against idolatry, might, in part, have prevented it.

<sup>y</sup> Vid. Cujacium, l. 2. Observ. 13. Ezech. Spanh. de Usu et Præst. Num. t. 2. p. 418. Vales. Not. in Euseb. p. 63, 64. Grot. in loc.

<sup>z</sup> Liv. l. 1. c. 45. Plin. Hist. Nat. l. 36. §. 21.

<sup>a</sup> Dionys. Hal. l. 4. c. 25, fin.

<sup>b</sup> This, I think, is the common opinion of learned men. Vid. Grot. in loc. Selden Marm. Arund. p. 1569, prop. fin. And is taken from Strabo, who expressly says that the Lyciarch was chosen by the cities of Lycia, l. 14. p. 665, A. Vid. Salmas. in Sol. p. 566. Usher. Not. in Polyc. p. 200, pr. Vales. Not. in Euseb. p. 63, 64.

<sup>c</sup> Selden is of this mind. Marm. Arund. p. 1569, et p. 1574, fin.

<sup>d</sup> Acts xix. 8. 10.

The same thing is supposed, by some learned men, to be hinted in the speech of the townclerk, when he calls the city of Ephesus *νεωκόρον*<sup>e</sup>, and when he speaks of a lawful assembly<sup>f</sup>.

It is a dispute among the learned men, whether there were more Asiarchs than one at a time<sup>g</sup>? Those who admit but one suppose that all who had once performed the office retained the title during life<sup>h</sup>. I must own, I have seen nothing conclusive as yet said by them who contend that there was one annual Asiarch only. There are various passages in ancient authors which seem to render it more probable that there were several who bore that high office at the same time<sup>i</sup>. Some of these, having a friendship for St. Paul, sent to him<sup>k</sup> not to adventure himself into the theatre, because they foresaw, that should he come there it would be with the utmost hazard of his life: for the people being violently enraged against him, would doubtless have demanded that he should be thrown to the wild beasts<sup>l</sup>; and probably it was not in their power at that time to withstand their request.

<sup>e</sup> Seld. *ibid.* p. 1573, 1574, 1575.    <sup>f</sup> Seld. *ibid.* p. 1575, 1576.

<sup>g</sup> Selden, Usher, and Basnage are of the opinion there were several.

<sup>h</sup> Thus Salmasius. Thus Spanheim and Valesius.

<sup>i</sup> Strabo, l. 14. p. 649. says, that some of the Trallians were always of the number of Asiarchs. Aristides, *Γίνομαι τρίτος ἢ τέταρτος τῇ χειροτονίᾳ*, was chosen third or fourth Asiarch. *Crat. Sacr.* 4. p. 613, C. et 614, C. fin. Add to this the passage of Dominus, quoted afterwards from Malela.

<sup>k</sup> Strabo tells us they were the wealthiest and most powerful of the province who were Asiarchs, *ubi supra*.

<sup>l</sup> Thus the people demanded of Philip the Asiarch at Smyrna, to let loose a lion upon Polycarp; but he excused himself by say-

It is afterwards said, that *the townclerk appeased the people*<sup>m</sup>. The word we render *townclerk* is γραμματεὺς. If there be truth in what Dominus relates concerning the officers who presided over the games of Antioch, and certainly he could not but be well acquainted with things of so public a nature transacted in his own city, I think it is highly probable that the γραμματεὺς here spoken of was a person of far greater authority than the clerk of the city of Ephesus. He tells us, that besides the Syriarch there was the Alytarch, γραμματεὺς, and the Amphitales; that the Alytarch represented Jupiter, γραμματεὺς represented Apollo, and that the Amphitales represented Mercury, and that they had suitable honours paid them by all the people<sup>n</sup>. If there were such officers as these at the public games in Ephesus, (and I think it is generally allowed that as the games exhibited, though in different cities, and different parts of the world, were the same, so there were the same kind of officers who presided over them,) who more proper to speak to the enraged multitude? who so likely to have weight and influence, and the force of an oracle in what he said, as he to whom they paid the honours due to Apollo? Apuleius also informs us, that in Egypt one of the officers who presided over their sacred rites was called γραμματεὺς<sup>o</sup>.

§. 4. The townclerk, or this religious officer, who represented Apollo, in the speech he makes to the

ing, that that part of the games was already over. Martyr. Polyc. p. 200. Possibly this could not have been urged at the time which is now before us at Ephesus.

<sup>m</sup> Ver. 35.

<sup>n</sup> Joan. Malela, p. 374, &c.

<sup>o</sup> In Milesia undecima cit. Basnage, Annal. vol. 1. p. 673.

people, says, *What man is there that knoweth not that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great goddess Diana and of the image which fell down from Jupiter*<sup>p</sup>? The word we translate *worshipper* is νεωκόρον. The word, I think, which comes nearest to it in our language is *churchwarden*. The citizens of Ephesus were wardens of Diana's temple, to see not only to the necessary repairs of it, but that it was always kept clean and neat; that at the proper seasons it was beautified and adorned, and that nothing necessary to the splendour of her worship was at any time wanting. This title of νεωκόρος is thought by some learned men to belong more peculiarly to the city of Ephesus at the time the public games were there exhibited<sup>q</sup>. It is remarkable, that there are several coins of that city still extant which have this word at length upon them, Ἐφεσίων νεωκόρων, and some that have the word *Diana* added thereto<sup>r</sup>. We learn also from coins, that several other cities were dignified with the same title.

§. 5. The townclerk adds, *and of the image which fell down from Jupiter*. I have not as yet met with any other author who asserts that the image of Diana in the temple of Ephesus fell down from Jupiter; but nothing is more probable than it was given out and believed so to be. For this was a thing often pretended by the heathen nations, that the images they worshipped fell down from heaven<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>p</sup> Ver. 35.

<sup>q</sup> Seld. Marm. Arund. p. 1573, 1574. Hammond in loc.

<sup>r</sup> Seld. ibid. p. 1571, 1572. Vid. Wolfii Cur. et auctores ibi citat.

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Suid. in voc. Διοπετές. And compare it with those words



This was said of the Palladium, or image of the goddess Pallas, in the city of Troy<sup>t</sup>. This was said of the Ancile, or Target at Rome, in the reign of Numa<sup>u</sup>. The image of the goddess Cybele was said to fall down from Jupiter at Pessinus in Phrygia, and a solemn embassy was sent by the Romans to request this image, and bring it to Rome<sup>x</sup>. We learn from Euripides, that the same thing was said of the image of Taurica Diana<sup>y</sup>. Nothing therefore more likely than that this was the prevailing opinion also concerning the image of Ephesian Diana; to which the antiquity of the image might not a little contribute. All authors agree that it was esteemed very ancient<sup>z</sup>, and though made of wood, yet perished not when the temple was burnt<sup>a</sup>. That this was the prevailing opinion seems also confirmed by this circumstance, that usually wherever they built

of Tully, *Alterum (simulachrum) erat tale, ut homines, cum viderent, aut ipsam videre Cererem, aut effigiem Cereris, non humana manu factam, sed cœlo delapsam, arbitrarentur. In Verrem, l. 5. §. 187, fin.*

<sup>t</sup> Schol. in Virg. *Æneid.* 2. v. 162.

<sup>u</sup> Ἐν δὲ ταῖς πέλταις——μίαν εἶναι λέγουσι διοπετῇ. *Dionys. Hal. Antiq. Rom.* l. 2. c. 71. *Plut. in Num.* p. 148.

<sup>x</sup> *Herodian.* l. 1. c. 35. p. 26.

<sup>y</sup> *Iphigen. in Tauris*, v. 87. 88. 977. 978. Διοπετὲς λαβεῖν ἄγαλμα, et v. 1384. τὸ δ' οὐρανοῦ πέσημα τῆς Διὸς κόρης ἄγαλμα.

<sup>z</sup> *Plin. Hist. Nat.* l. 16. §. 79. n. 7. Pliny wonders that *Mucianus* should say that the image was made of the wood of a vine, and pretend to name the artificer who made it, when he himself affirms, that it is not only more ancient than father *Bacchus*, but than *Minerva* also, that is, older than the planting of the vine, and the invention of arts. *Pausan. Achaic.* p. 207. l. 11, 12, &c. *Messen.* p. 141. l. 35.

<sup>a</sup> *Vitigineum et nunquam mutatum septies restituto templo. Plin. ibid.* n. 5.



temples to Diana, the image erected was formed after the model of that at Ephesus<sup>b</sup>.

§. 6. The townclerk further says, *If Demetrius, or the craftsmen with him, have a matter against any man, the law is open, and there are deputies*<sup>c</sup>. The Greek words are, Ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται, καὶ ἀνθύπατοί εἰσι, *The courts of law are held, and there are the proconsuls*. The first I take to be the courts where civil actions were tried, and matters of property determined; the other, to refer to criminal causes. If Demetrius charged any person with debt or damages, he might plead his cause in the former courts; if with crimes, before the proconsul. But here it is very properly asked, why mention is made of proconsuls in the plural number, when it is very well known that there never was more than one proconsul to whom was committed the government of the province? In the Syriac translation is read proconsul in the singular number; and were there any number of copies to support that reading, the difficulty would wholly vanish. The learned Grotius supposes that the proconsul and his *legatus* are here understood<sup>d</sup>; but I cannot be of his mind. The giving this title to both would be setting them upon the level; which would as much detract from the

<sup>b</sup> Strabo, l. 3. p. 160, A. l. 4. p. 179, B. 180, A. C. D. 184, A. Ἐφεσίαν δὲ Ἀρτεμιν πόλεις τε ἰνομάζουσιν αἱ πᾶσαι καὶ ἄνδρες ἰδίᾳ θεῶν μάλιστα ἄγουσιν ἐν τιμῇ.——τρία δὲ ἄλλα ἐπὶ τούτοις συνετέλεσεν ἐς δόξαν· μέγεθός τε τοῦ ναοῦ, τὰ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κατασκευάσματα, ὑπερῆκετός· καὶ Ἐφεσίων τῆς πόλεως ἡ ἀκμὴ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ ἐπιφανὲς τῆς θεοῦ. Pausan. Messen. p. 141. l. 34, &c. Vid. Pausan. Corinth. p. 46. l. 2. et fere passim. Spanheim affirms, that this appears yet more fully from coins, in Observ. in Callim. p. 289. cit. Wolfii Cur. in Act. Apost. p. 1300.

<sup>c</sup> Acts xix. 38.

<sup>d</sup> In loc.

proconsul, as it added honour to the *legatus*. The Greeks were too great masters in the art of flattery to fall into such an absurdity. The learned and laborious Samuel Basnage<sup>e</sup> is of opinion that the province of Asia was at this time administered by Celer and Ælius, who were *procuratores Cæsaris*, and had poisoned Silanus the proconsul by order of Agrippina, the emperor's mother<sup>f</sup>. Grotius indeed says that Suilius was now proconsul<sup>g</sup>. But as there is no certain proof of this, so it is much more probable that he governed the province in the time of the emperor Claudius, with whom he was a favourite<sup>h</sup>. Celer and Ælius had in all probability the *ornamenta consularia*, that is, ensigns and ornaments of the consular dignity; for such many of the *procuratores* had<sup>i</sup>. And if the government of

<sup>e</sup> Annal. vol. I. p. 674. n. 11.

<sup>f</sup> Tacit. Ann. l. 13. c. 1.

<sup>g</sup> In Act. xix. 40.

<sup>h</sup> Therefore Suilius says of Seneca, whom he esteemed his principal enemy, *Infensum amicis Claudii, sub quo justissimum exsilium pertulisset. Tacit. Ann. l. 13. c. 42.* There is not the least likelihood that the court would suffer any person to go to Asia as proconsul in the room of Silanus, who was not entirely at their devotion, lest he should inquire into the murder, and punish the authors of it. For which reason I think Suilius could not be the person at this time. It is much more likely that the care of the province was committed to the two murderers, both upon the account of their own security, and as a reward of their villainy. And we find afterwards, in the fourth year of Nero, that Celer was charged with maladministration by the province of Asia; but, though not cleared, yet was protected from punishment by reason of this murder. And doubtless he well knew, that after the commission of such a fact, whatever injuries and oppressions he was guilty of, they must be all overlooked at the court of Rome. Tacit. Ann. l. 13. c. 33.

<sup>i</sup> Ornamenta consularia etiam procuratoribus ducenariis indulsit

the province was committed to them, they were *vice proconsulis*<sup>k</sup>. It was an easy, natural, and unstrained piece of flattery therefore to call them proconsuls. This seems a most probable conjecture; nor do I know any thing material that can be urged against it. Other conjectures might be made; but this looks so like the truth, that it is needless to offer them<sup>l</sup>. What renders this still the more probable is, that it had been the custom during the republic for the proconsul, when he left the province, to commit the government of it to the questor, as fully appears

Claudius. *Suet. Cl.* 24. 1. That is, to all those whose annual pay or allowance amounted to a certain sum. Vid. Dio, l. 53. p. 506, D.

<sup>k</sup> L. 2. C. de Pœnis; l. 4. C. ad leg. Fab. de Plagiar. l. 1. C. de Pedan. Jud. l. 3. C. ubi causa fiscal.

<sup>l</sup> The public games, which drew a great concourse of people from all parts, might possibly invite some of the neighbouring proconsuls to be present, such as those of Achaia, Cilicia, and Cyprus. To this it may be answered, that, if they were present, they could not sit as judges; for a proconsul had no power but in his own province. L. 1. ff. de Offic. Proc. True; but they might sit as assessors; and if any of their own provincials were accused, great deference would be paid to their opinion, and possibly the criminal might be sent home to be punished by themselves. L. 11. ff. de Custod. et Exhib. Reorum. Another objection is, that a president could not be absent from his province but one night. L. 15. ff. de Officio Præsidis. And the reason of the case, it is true, reaches the proconsul. Vid. l. 10. pr. ff. de Officio Proc. However, it is possible this law did not reach the proconsuls; for they had greater privileges than presidents. The proconsul had six fasces, the president but five; the proconsul could *deportare*, the president not. Vid. Voet. in Pandect. de Off. Præs. §. 1. fin. p. 86. Another conjecture may be, that a diocese or two of the province of Asia might belong to the proconsul of Cilicia, as it certainly did in the time of Tully. Vid. Epist. ad Attic. l. 6. 1, 2, 3.

from Tully's Epistles <sup>m</sup>. It is likely, that no sooner did the emperor hear of the death of Silanus, than he sent to the two procurators to take upon them the government. Thus Tiberius, the governor of Crete being dead, committed that island to the questor and his assessor, for the remainder of his life <sup>n</sup>.

§. 7. The townclerk further adds, *But if ye inquire any thing concerning other matters, it shall be determined in a lawful assembly* <sup>o</sup>. I take this to be meant of the assembly of the diocese or district of Ephesus, of which Pliny gives an account. There were a great number of districts in Asia, each of which had an assembly. Some of these are referred to by Tully in his Epistles to Atticus <sup>p</sup>; many more of them are mentioned by Pliny, among which this of Ephesus is one <sup>q</sup>. The townclerk, or γραμματεὺς, says, If Demetrius had any claim of property to make, there were civil courts in which he might sue. If he had crimes to object to any person, the proconsuls were there; but if he had complaints of a political nature, if he had any thing to say that might redound to the honour of the goddess, the good of the temple, and the public utility, there was the usual legal assembly of the district belonging to Ephesus, in which it ought to be proposed.

§. 8. We are told in the History of the Acts, that Paul and Barnabas being at Lystra, and having

<sup>m</sup> Epist. Fam. l. 2. ep. 15. ad Attic. l. 6. ep. 3, 4, 5. prop. fin. et 6.

<sup>n</sup> Τότε δὲ ἡ Κρήτη, τοῦ ἄρχοντος αὐτῆς ἀποθανόντος, τῷ τε ταμίᾳ καὶ τῷ παρέδρῳ αὐτοῦ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον προσετάχθη. Dio, l. 57. p. 611, C.

<sup>o</sup> Ver. 39. <sup>p</sup> L. 5. ep. 20. et ult. <sup>q</sup> H. N. l. 5. §. 25. 29, 30, 32, 33. Vid. Cellar. Geog. Ant. v. 2. p. 127.

healed a man lame from his mother's womb, the people said, *The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men: and called Barnabas, Jupiter; and Paul, Mercury, because he was the chief speaker*<sup>r</sup>. It was a common opinion among the heathen, that their gods sometimes came down from heaven, appeared in human shape, and conversed with men, as most evidently appears from their poets and other writers. This was believed of Jupiter and Mercury in particular<sup>s</sup>. Hence the name of Ζεὺς καταβάτης. Mercury, as being Jupiter's servant, μεγίστῳ Ζηνὶ δαιμόνων λάτρης<sup>t</sup>, made frequent descents on his messages, and therefore was thought to be seen much oftener than Jupiter. But when Jupiter condescended to visit the earth, Mercury was supposed usually to be his attendant<sup>u</sup>. That Mercury was esteemed the interpreter of the gods, and as their mouth to men, and therefore was looked upon and addressed to as the god of eloquence, is confirmed to us by a great variety of authors<sup>x</sup>. For

<sup>r</sup> Acts xiv. 8—12.

<sup>s</sup> Ovid. Metam. Baucis et Philemon.

<sup>t</sup> Eurip. Ion. v. 4. Vid. Paus. Arcad. p. 264. l. 8. Ovid. Fast. l. 2. v. 608. 611. Sil. Ital. l. 3. Magni Jovis et deorum nuncium, Hor. Carm. l. 1. Od. 10. Loc. Philopat. p. 995, C. et Deor. Dial. p. 179, fin.

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Plaut. Amph. Ovid. Fast. l. 5. v. 495, &c.

<sup>x</sup> Τὸν ἑρμηνέα καὶ προφήτην τῶν θεῶν, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ Ἑρμῆς ἀνόμασται. Phil. leg. ad Caium, p. 1005, E. Τοῦ δὲ λόγου τοῦ πάντων ποιητικοῦ τε καὶ ἑρμηνευτικοῦ ὁ Ἑρμῆς παραστατικός. Porph. in Euseb. Præp. l. 3. c. 11. p. 114. Hor. Carm. l. 1. Od. 10. v. 1, &c. Ovid. Fast. l. 5. v. 668. Τὸν Ἑρμῆν——τὸν τῆς σοφίας ταύτης ἡγεμόνα καὶ προστάτην. Aristid. Platon. 1. p. 178, fin. Vid. Orat. in Min. p. 26, A. Θεὸς ὁ τῶν λόγων ἡγεμὼν. Jambl. de Myst. Ægypt. pr. Lucian. Apol. pro Mer. cond. p. 504, A. Pseudolog. p. 600, fin. Dial. Deor. p. 180, B. Gall. 234, A. Ἑρμοῦ——λαλίστατον καὶ λογιωτάτον θεῶν ἀπάνταν.



this reason is it said, *They took Paul for Mercury, because he was the chief speaker.*

§. 9. It follows, *Then the priest of Jupiter, which was before their city*<sup>y</sup>. That it was their custom to build temples to their deities in the suburbs<sup>z</sup>, and to place the images of their tutelar deities before the city at the gates, is fully evident from several of their poets<sup>a</sup> and other writers. *Jupiter, which was before their city*, may be understood therefore of the image of Jupiter *πολιεύς*<sup>b</sup>, which was placed at the gate of the city, or, it may be, in some temple erected in the suburbs before the gate. The priest of this Jupiter brought oxen and garlands to the gates of the house where the apostles were, in order to have done sacrifice<sup>c</sup>. That it was usual to sacrifice oxen to Jupiter is clear from Homer<sup>d</sup>, Strabo<sup>e</sup>, Livy<sup>f</sup>, and others<sup>g</sup>. That they made use of gar-

<sup>y</sup> Ver. 13.

<sup>z</sup> That of Jupiter in particular, Liv. l. 34. c. 53, prop. fin. Vid. Alex. ab Alex. l. 2. c. 4.

<sup>a</sup> "Ανασσ' "Ογκα πρὸ πόλεως. Æschyl. septem contra Theb. v. 170. Γίνωσκε γὰρ ὅτι ἐξωγράφουν ταύτην πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν τῆς πόλεως, ἣν καὶ ὁ Λυκόφρων πυλαίτιδα λέγει διὰ τὸ ἄνωθεν ἵστασθαι ταύτην τῶν τῆς πόλεως πυλῶν. Schol. Ibid. Vid. Lycop. v. 356. Paus. Bæot. p. 291. l. 7. et Syb. not.

<sup>b</sup> Arist. de Mundo. Pausan. Attic. p. 27. l. 30. <sup>c</sup> Ver. 13.

<sup>d</sup> Iliad. l. 2. v. 402.

Αὐτὰρ ὁ βοῦν ἱέρευσεν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων

Πίονα, πενταέτηρον, ὑπερμενεί Κρονίῳ.

<sup>e</sup> L. 10. p. 483, fin. Τὸν μὲν οὖν βοῦν θύει τῷ Διί.

<sup>f</sup> L. 41. c. 14. p. 1235, pr. Immolantibus Jovi singulis bubus.

<sup>g</sup> Ἀθηναίων βασιλεύοντος Ἐρεχθέως τότε πρῶτον βοῦν ἔκτεινεν ὁ βουφάνος ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ πολιέως Διός. Pausan. Attic. p. 27. l. 30. Vid. p. 22. l. 22. Euseb. in Chron. p. 75. et 109. says that Cecrops first sacrificed an ox to Jupiter; but he seems to be herein mistaken: for Pausanias avers, that although Cecrops first called Jupiter su-



lands at the time they sacrificed, both to adorn the victim which was to be offered, and the priest himself, appears from Pliny<sup>h</sup>, and many other authors<sup>i</sup>.

§. 10. It is afterwards said that the people of Lystra, being persuaded by the Jews which came from Antioch and Iconium, *stoned Paul, and drew him out of their city*<sup>k</sup>. That stoning was a punishment in use among the Greeks, we learn from Ælian<sup>l</sup> and others<sup>m</sup>. Some possibly may admire at the sudden change here related, that the people should be so wrapped up in admiration of St. Paul as to be ready to do sacrifice to him one while, and soon after be prevailed with to stone him. There is an account in the latter end of this History of the Acts, of a change rather more sudden than this, but in the direct contrary way. The people of Melita, while they saw a viper hanging upon Paul's hand, looked upon him as a murderer whom vengeance suffered not to live; but when he had shook it off,

preme, he sacrificed nothing to him that had life. Arcad. p. 237. l. 15. Meursius has well explained the occasion of this mistake. De Reg. et Archont. l. 1. c. 9. Ovid. Fast. l. 5. v. 514.

. . . . . Audito palluit ille Jove.

Ut rediit animus, cultorem pauperis agri

Immolât, et magno torret in igne bovem.

Dion. Hal. Antiq. Rom. l. 1. §. 39, fin. Καὶ θύει τῷ θεῷ (Διὶ Εὐρεσίῳ) δάμαλιν ἓνα.

<sup>h</sup> Nat. Hist. l. 16. c. 4.

<sup>i</sup> Dionys. Hal. l. 1. §. 55, fin. Οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ τὸν Αἰνείαν, παρασκευασθείσης θυσίας, ἔχοντες τοὺς στεφάνους περὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἔστησαν. Juv. Sat. 13. v. 63. Prudentius, v. 1021. Servius ad Æneid. 2. v. 133. Vid. Walchii Not. ad Lact. p. 160. Potter's Greek Antiq. l. 1. p. 199.

<sup>k</sup> Ver. 19.

<sup>l</sup> Var. Hist. l. 5. c. 19. p. 434.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Soph. Œd. Col. v. 448. et Ajac. Flagel. v. 743. Eurip. Orest. v. 50. 59. 442. 535. 563. 613. 624. 861. et 944. Potter's Greek Antiq. vol. 1. p. 128, pr.

and they saw no harm followed, they took him for a god<sup>n</sup>. Persons must know very little of human nature, and have had small experience of mankind, that cannot give credit to such sudden changes as these in the populace. Menedemus the philosopher was had in such contempt by his fellow-citizens, that he was called *dog, trifler, fool*. Afterwards he was so highly admired by them, that they put the government of their city into his hands<sup>o</sup>. Democritus was despised by his countrymen for having wasted his patrimony, and was indicted by them for a spendthrift: but having foretold some events which came to pass, he was judged worthy of divine honours<sup>p</sup>. Aristophanes the comedian says of the people of Athens, esteemed the politest of all the Greeks, He who is nobody with them to-day, to-morrow shall be esteemed *ὑπερμέγας, an exceeding great man*<sup>q</sup>. The reverse of this was equally true of them. For, it may be, no people in the world were more fickle, inconstant, and mutable; and I much question whether any place affords so many examples of persons who had done the greatest service to their country, and were in the highest honour, soon after stripped of all, banished, or otherwise punished<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>n</sup> Acts xxviii. 4. 6.      <sup>o</sup> Diog. l. 2. n. 140.

<sup>p</sup> Diog. Laert. l. 9. n. 39. compared with Athenæus, quoted by Menagius, in his notes upon the place.

<sup>q</sup> Ὡς νῦν μὲν οὐδεὶς, αὐριον δ' ὑπερμέγας. Equit. act 1. sc. 2. p. 296. Ἐντὸς δέκα ἡμερῶν Θεὸς αὐτοῖς δόξεις, οἷς νῦν καὶ πλῆθος. Mar. Anton. de reb. suis, l. 4. §. 16. Hoc in imperita multitudo est vitiosissimum, varietas et inconstantia, et crebra tanquam tempestatum, sic sententiarum commutatio. Cic. pro domo sua. Idem eadem possunt horam durare probantes? Hor. l. 1. ep. 1. v. 82.

<sup>r</sup> Thucydides——tum scripsisse dicitur, cum a republica re-

§. 11. When St. Paul entered Athens, it raised his indignation not a little to see the city wholly given to idolatry<sup>s</sup>. The word in the Greek is *κατείδωλον*, *full of idols*<sup>t</sup>. In this respect, I suppose, no city in the world ever equalled it. The words which Lucian puts into the mouth of Prometheus were literally true here: “Every where were to be seen  
“altars, and sacrifices, and temples, and feasts; all  
“the streets, and all assemblies, were full of Jupiter<sup>u</sup>,” and other deities, as any one may be convinced, who will be at the pains to read the description of Athens left us by Pausanias, or the *Athenæ Atticæ* of the learned Meursius.

It is a thing so well known, that it is almost needless to observe to you, that Athens abounded with schools, that many persons came thither from all parts to finish their education, and that it was a place of great resort for men of fortune, leisure, and learning<sup>x</sup>. It is easy to conceive that in such a place there should be a general thirst after knowledge, and a continual inquiry made, whether there

motus, atque id quod optimo cuique Athenis accidere solitum est, in exilium pulsus esset. *Cic. de Orat.* l. 2. n. 13. Vid. Val. Max. de Ingrat. Nothing is more true than the observation of Livy, l. 24. §. 25. *Hæc natura multitudinis est, aut servit humiliter, aut superbe dominatur.* They either cringe, fawn, and are in the lowest manner servile, or else tyrannize and domineer in the haughtiest way possible, and oftentimes on a sudden pass from the one of these to the other.

<sup>s</sup> Acts xvii. 16.

<sup>t</sup> After the same way of speaking, Strabo, describing the country about Marseilles, calls it *κατάμπελον*, *crowded with vineyards*. L. 3. p. 179, fin.

<sup>u</sup> Prometh. p. 113, fin.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Meursii Fortun. *Attica*, cap. 8.

was any thing new either in philosophy or history, any new opinion divulged, or any new thing that had happened in the world. We know, from our own experience, that in all public places, where there is a concourse of people of condition, there is usually discovered not a little curiosity of this kind. It can be matter of no admiration therefore, when it is said in the Acts of the Apostles, *That all the Athenians, and strangers which were there, spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or hear some new thing*<sup>y</sup>. This character was due to them of a long standing. Many years before, when they had an affair of the most urgent nature upon their hands, when Philip king of Macedon was making large steps towards the ruin of their state, they indulged this humour to a very great excess. Demosthenes, in one of his Orations, in order to encourage them to act vigorously against the invader, tells them, "They had much more reason to expect  
 " the favour of the gods than he had, because they  
 " were more pious and just. But, you will say,  
 " How then came he to have greater success in the  
 " former war than we had? The answer is, Because  
 " Philip acts the part of a soldier, endures fatigue,  
 " faces danger without any regard to the seasons of  
 " the year, and neglecting no opportunity; whilst  
 " we Athenians sit at home, doing nothing, always  
 " delaying, and making decrees<sup>z</sup>, and asking in the  
 " forum if there be any thing new<sup>2</sup>." In other his Orations also, he plainly hints to them that they

<sup>y</sup> Acts xvii. 21.

<sup>z</sup> The reader may see what he means by this in his Oration de Republ. Ord. p. 71, fin. et 72.

<sup>2</sup> Ad Phil. Epistolam, p. 66, E.

were at least as solicitous, as active, as diligent to learn the news, as they were in this most important business of opposing Philip, if not more so<sup>b</sup>.

Certain learned men, who had heard St. Paul discoursing in the forum<sup>c</sup>, more particularly some of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, curious to know what new opinions he taught, conducted him to Mars' Hill, in the Greek, to Areopagus, a place of the same note at Athens as Westminster-hall or the house of lords is with us. The speech St. Paul makes to them in this place begins thus; *Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious*<sup>d</sup>. That person must be a great stranger

<sup>b</sup> Philip. 4, pr. et Philip. 1. p. 16, A.

<sup>c</sup> Paul disputed in the market daily with them that met him, Acts xvii. 17. ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ. The forum or market among the Greeks served not only the purpose of buying and selling all sorts of merchandise, but of holding their public assemblies; and therefore were usually places of a very large extent, in which also persons of leisure met for the sake of conversation and news. There were many of these in the city of Athens, but the most noted, and that which probably was called ἡ ἀγορά, the market, without adding any other name to it, was Ceramicus. And this, it is probable, is to be here understood. St. Paul discoursed with philosophers and others who met here for conversation. In this place was not only στοὰ βασιλῆως, but στοὰ πικίλη; also the school of the Stoic philosophers. Vid. Pausan. Attic. Compare p. 3. l. 7, &c. p. 14. l. 10. et p. 15. 9. et Achaic. p. 228. l. 27, &c. et Menag. Not. in Diogen. Laert. l. 7. §. 5. et Wolf. Cur. in loc.

<sup>d</sup> Acts xvii. 22. It is thought by some learned men that these words are not rightly translated, and that the apostle designed them as a commendation of the Athenians; as much as to say, *I perceive that in all things ye are very pious or devout*. It undoubtedly became the apostle, in the beginning of his speech, to make use of such a word as would give the least offence, otherwise he had destroyed his own design, and lost their attention; but that he had any thought herein to commend or flatter them,



to their history, who does not immediately see the truth and justice of this character. Philostratus says, that the first discourse Apollonius made at Athens was upon the subject of sacrifices, because he saw that the Athenians were *φιλοθύται*, *addicted to sacrificing*<sup>e</sup>. Xenophon says of them, that they observed twice as many festivals as any other people<sup>f</sup>, and gives it as one reason why public business was retarded, and persons waited sometimes a whole year for an answer either from the senate or the people, “that they were obliged to keep such a “number of feasts as did no other city of the “Greeks<sup>g</sup>.” Pausanias tells us that they worshipped the gods more than others, or exceeded all others in their piety towards the gods<sup>h</sup>. And Sophocles, that they went beyond all the world in the honours they paid the gods<sup>i</sup>. Dionysius Halicarnassensis says, that if any praise belonged to the city of the Athenians, this chiefly did so, that in all things, and at all times, they followed the gods, and performed no-

is contrary both to the whole drift of the history, and to his own notions as a Christian. What was it raised his indignation, but his seeing the city wholly given to idolatry? What was it engaged him in disputes daily in the market, but the great number of their *σεβάσματα*, or *objects of devotion*, that is, their excessive superstition? Although therefore the word *δαιμονοεστεροι* may be sometimes used in a good sense, yet doubtless the apostle here meant it in the bad sense. There is no one who has looked into Demosthenes, or almost any Greek writer, but must see the propriety of *Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*, *Ye men of Athens*, however distant this may seem from our modern way of address.

<sup>e</sup> De Vit. Apoll. l. 4. c. 6.      <sup>f</sup> De Repub. Athen. p. 700, A.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. p. 699, B.      <sup>h</sup> Attic. p. 15. l. 12. et p. 22. l. 13.

<sup>i</sup> ‘Ὅθ’ οὐνεκ’, εἴ τις γῆ θεοὺς ἐπίσταται

Τιμαῖς σεβίζειν, ἥδε τοῦθ’ ἐπερφέρει—

Ed. Col. v. 1060. Vid. et v. 1186. et 264.

thing without their direction<sup>k</sup>. And Josephus lays it down as a thing universally acknowledged, “All men say that the Athenians are the most pious of all the Greeks<sup>l</sup>.”

§. 12. That which gave occasion to St. Paul to remark the greatness of their superstition, and to begin his speech from thence, was not only his having seen the city crowded with temples, altars, and idols<sup>m</sup>, but his having also observed an altar erected *to the unknown God*<sup>n</sup>. To such a height of superstition were they arrived, that they not only, by public authority, received the gods of foreign nations, but raised altars also to gods unknown. Strabo says, “That the Athenians, as they were wont to take other things from foreigners,” (he had just before instanced in their instruments of music,) “so the gods also. For they have received from strangers many sacred rites, even to such a degree as to be made the subject of comedy<sup>o</sup>.” St. Jerom informs us, that there was an altar at Athens dedicated to the gods of Asia, and Europe, and Africa, to the unknown and foreign gods<sup>p</sup>. This was receiving at once all the gods of the then known world, both those whose names they had learnt, and those which they had not so much as heard of. Pausanias tells us that there was an altar of the

<sup>k</sup> Εἰ γάρ τι ἄλλο τῆς Ἀθηναίων πόλεως, καὶ τοῦτ' ἐν πρώτοις ἐστὶν ἐγκώμιον, τὸ περὶ παντὸς πράγματος, καὶ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ τοῖς θεοῖς ἔπεσθαι, καὶ μηδὲν ἄνευ μαντικῆς καὶ χρησμῶν ἐπιτελεῖν. De Thucyd. Hist. Jud. §. 40. med.

<sup>l</sup> Contr. Apion. l. 2. §. 11. p. 1373.

<sup>m</sup> These are the σεβάσματα, mentioned v. 23.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> L. 10. p. 471, C.

<sup>p</sup> Comment. ad Tit. 1.

unknown gods at Olympia<sup>q</sup>; that there was also an altar or altars of the gods named *unknown* at Phalerus, the nearest port to Athens<sup>r</sup>. And Apollonius affirms, that at Athens were built altars of unknown gods<sup>s</sup>. These things render it exceeding probable that there might be one or more altars in that great city with this inscription, *To the unknown God*. But that which puts it beyond all doubt are the words of Lucian in his *Philopatris*, who introduces one swearing by the unknown God at Athens<sup>t</sup>, and another determining, “That he will with hands “lifted up to heaven worship the unknown God at “Athens<sup>u</sup>.”

It has been thought by learned men, and, I think, not without some degree of probability, that by *the unknown God*, to whom this altar was dedicated, the Athenians meant the God of the Jews<sup>x</sup>. From what has been already said, it appears plainly to have been a prevailing humour with them to receive the gods of all foreign countries, and why not the God of the Jews among the rest? If the relation given us by Josephus of the vision of Alexander the Great, and his adoring the name of God engraven upon the golden plate in the fore-front of the mitre, when Jaddus the high priest met him at his entry

<sup>q</sup> Eliac. I. p. 162. l. 6.

<sup>r</sup> Βωμοὶ δὲ θεῶν τε ὀνομαζομένων ἀγνώστων, καὶ ἡρώων, καὶ παιδῶν τῶν Θεσιέως καὶ Φαληγεῶς. Attic. p. 1. l. 34.

<sup>s</sup> Ἀθηνήσιν, οὓς καὶ ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων βωμοὶ ἱδρύνται. Philost. de Vit. Apol. l. 6. c. 2, fin.

<sup>t</sup> Νῆ τὸν ἄγνωστον ἐν Ἀθήναις. Philopat. p. 997, A.

<sup>u</sup> Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἐν Ἀθήναις ἄγνωστον ἐφευρόντες, καὶ προσκυνήσαντες χεῖρας εἰς οὐρανὸν ἐκτείναντες τούτῳ εὐχαριστήσομεν. Ibid. prop. fin.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Wolfii Cur. in loc. Basnage, Ann. vol. 1. p. 636.

into Jerusalem<sup>y</sup>, be true, (and I can see no just reason why the truth of it should be questioned,) the fame of this alone would be a sufficient inducement to the Athenians to erect an altar to the God of the Jews. It is certain, that after this expedition of Alexander many of the Jews were taken into his army<sup>z</sup>, the Jews and Greeks became better acquainted, the Jews soon spread themselves through Greece, there was a communication opened, and a frequent intercourse between Greece and Judæa, and leagues of friendship were entered into<sup>a</sup>, and particularly between the Athenians and Hyrcanus the high priest of the Jewish nation, to whom, for the many kindnesses he had shewn them, they erected a brazen statue in one of their temples at Athens<sup>b</sup>.

The reason why they should give the title of *unknown* to the God of the Jews is sufficiently easy and obvious. The Jews themselves religiously abstained from uttering the name of God<sup>c</sup>, so that no foreigner could ever learn any name peculiar to him. Dio says, that the Jews esteemed him ἄρρητον, *not to be expressed*<sup>d</sup>. For which reason the emperor Caius replied to Philo, and the Jews that were with him, “Ye are the god-haters, who esteem not me a “god, though acknowledged to be so by all others, “ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀκατονόμαστον ὑμῖν, *but him that is un-*

<sup>y</sup> Antiq. l. 11. c. 8. §. 5.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. fin.

<sup>a</sup> Antiq. l. 12. c. 4. §. 10. et l. 13. c. 5. §. 8. Vid. Gronov. not. ad Jos. p. 44.

<sup>b</sup> Antiq. l. 14. c. 8. §. ult.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Philon. Vit. Mosis, l. 3. p. 683, D. E. 684, A. B.

<sup>d</sup> L. 36. p. 37, C.

“*named by you<sup>e</sup>.*” Therefore Lucan<sup>f</sup> and Trebellius Pollio<sup>g</sup> call him *incertus Deus*: and doubtless the Jews always spoke of him as incomprehensible and unutterable. No wonder therefore if the Athenians should inscribe upon the altar intended him, *To the unknown God*. And most certainly the apostle had hereby given him the fairest opportunity imaginable to instruct the Athenians in the knowledge of the only true God; and with great reason told them, that *the God whom they ignorantly worshipped, declared he unto them<sup>h</sup>.*

It is said, that among St. Paul’s converts at this place was Dionysius the Areopagite<sup>i</sup>. The Areopagites were not only the highest court of judicature in Athens, but also the supreme council in affairs of state<sup>k</sup>: men of the best families and fortunes, and

<sup>e</sup> Leg. ad Caium, p. 1041, A. B. It is in our printed copies, θεομισεῖς, *ye that are hated by the gods*, but I think it ought to be read θεομίσεις.

<sup>f</sup> . . . . . et dedita sacris

Incerti Judæa Dei. Lib. 2.

<sup>g</sup> Claud. p. 351. <sup>h</sup> Acts xvii. 23. <sup>i</sup> Ch. xvii. v. 34.

<sup>k</sup> So Meursius expressly calls it, *Supremus omnino senatus erat*; and quotes both Plutarch and Heliodorus to authorize the expression. Vid. Meurs. Areop. cap. 1. p. 5, 6. Our very learned archbishop observes, that the council of the Areopagites, though inferior to the senate of the Five Hundred in order and power, yet was superior to it in dignity and esteem, and therefore was called ἡ ἄνω βουλὴ. Gr. Antiq. b. 1. c. 18. p. 90. The senate of the Five Hundred were chosen annually; the Areopagites sat for life, or till some very gross misbehaviour. To shew what part they held in the Athenian government, I need only transcribe the words of Tully: Ut, si quis dicat, Atheniensium rempublicam concilio regi, desit illud, Areopagi: Sic, cum dicimus, providentia mundum administrari, deesse arbitrator, deorum. *De Nat. Deor.*



who had the fairest reputations, were usually taken into this court. And it may be, no court in the world was ever so illustrious and so highly esteemed as this. There are few or none of the ancient authors but make laudable mention hereof.

St. Paul, it is said, departed from the island of Melita, *in a ship of Alexandria, whose sign was Castor and Pollux*<sup>1</sup>. It was the custom with the ancient Greeks and Romans to place the image or picture of the deity, to whose care and protection they committed the ship, at the stern, and to place the sign, by the name of which the ship was called, at the head<sup>m</sup>. It is a dispute among learned men, whether the tutelar deity were not also sometimes the sign, and for that reason placed both at head and stern<sup>n</sup>. There are undeniable instances in ancient authors, wherein some of the heathen deities are placed at the head<sup>o</sup>. And it is not very likely that such ships should have other deities at the stern, to whose tutelage they were committed. Of this sort is the ship which carried Paul to Italy. It had Castor and Pollux, two heathen deities, at

l. 2. §. 74. And it is not seldom that he calls the senate of Rome by the name of this court: *Romanæ autem se res sic habent. Senatus*, Ἀρεῖος πύργος, nihil constantius, nihil severius, nihil fortius. *Ad Att.* l. 1. ep. 14.

<sup>1</sup> Acts xxviii. 11.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Hammond. in loc. Virg. *Æneid.* l. 10. v. 157, 166, et 171. Ovid. *de Trist. Eleg.* 9. v. 1, 2. Pers. *Sat.* 6. v. 30.

<sup>n</sup> Selden denies it. Vid. *de Diis Syris*, Syntag. 2. c. 16. p. 400. And Grotius seems to be of the same opinion, in loc. Salmasius in Solin. p. 403. defends the contrary, as also many other authors.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Herod. l. 3. c. 37. *Æschyl.* Sept. contra Thebas, v. 214. et Not. Stanleii.

the head <sup>p</sup>; and doubtless, if any <sup>q</sup>, had the same also at the stern, as the tutelar gods, protectors, and patrons of the ship, these being esteemed deities peculiarly favourable to mariners <sup>r</sup>.

<sup>p</sup> In the same manner is a ship, which used to carry corn from Egypt to Italy, described by Lucian as having the goddess Isis, who gave name to the ship, at the head. Vid. Navig. p. 665, C. et 669, A. B.

<sup>q</sup> It is not certain that all such ships as had their tutelar deities at the head had them also at stern. Vid. Not. Stanl. ante citat.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Hor. Carm. l. 1. Od. 3. v. 1. et Od. 12. v. 27, &c. Ovid. de Trist. Eleg. 9. v. 45. Lucian. Apol. et Merc. p. 185, D. E. Max. Tyr. Iterum. Quis sit Deus Socr. fin. p. 173. et Not. Davisii.

## CHAP. IX.

*Roman customs confirmed.*

§. 1. MOST of the Roman customs referred to are so well known that I need say little to confirm them. That the ordinary residence of the Roman procurator in Judæa was at Cæsarea, and that the Romans had a military force both at Cæsarea and Jerusalem, are fully evident from Josephus <sup>a</sup>.

That the Roman army consisted of legions, and that a legion was made up of a certain number of cohorts, as our army is divided into regiments, and every regiment into companies, and that a cohort was made up of six orders or centuries <sup>b</sup>, over each of which orders was placed a centurion, is known almost to every one that has but heard of the Romans. But besides the cohorts, which were formed into legions, there were other cohorts separate and distinct from any legion, something like our independent companies, as is abundantly evident from Cæsar, Strabo, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Josephus. Such were *cohortes urbanæ*, *cohortes prætoriæ*: such, I take it, were *cohortes colonicæ*, mentioned by Cæsar <sup>c</sup>, and the cohorts placed by the emperor Claudius at Puteoli and Ostia for the prevention of fire <sup>d</sup>. Such confessedly were the auxiliary cohorts,

<sup>a</sup> Compare Acts xxi. 32. xxiii. 23, 24. xxiv. 7. and Antiq. l. 18. c. 3. §. 1. c. 4. §. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Cæteri (centuriones) juxta suam quisque centuriam. Tac. Hist. l. 2. c. 89.

<sup>c</sup> De Bell. Civ. l. 2. c. 19. n. 4.

<sup>d</sup> Suet. Claud. c. 25. n. 7.

as *cohors Usipiorum*<sup>e</sup>, *cohortes Batavorum*<sup>f</sup>, and others mentioned by Tacitus<sup>g</sup>.

The commanding officer of these cohorts was called *tribunus*, or *præfectus cohortis*; by the former name, if the cohort was composed of Roman citizens; by the latter, if of auxiliaries<sup>h</sup>. Both these words are rendered into the Greek by the word *χιλίαρχος*, *captain of a thousand*, and indeed the cohorts of this sort frequently consisted of a thousand men<sup>i</sup>, whereas the legionary cohorts never exceeded six hundred, and seldom were so many<sup>k</sup>. I remem-

<sup>e</sup> Agric. c. 28.

<sup>f</sup> Hist. l. i. c. 59.

<sup>g</sup> Hist. l. 2. c. 89. et l. 4. c. 70.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. Polyb. l. 6. p. 482, A. Tac. Hist. l. i. §. 20. p. 50. l. ult. l. 4. c. 31, 32. l. 3. c. 68. et c. 35. Ann. l. 6. c. 9, prop. fin. et l. 12. c. 17. l. ult. Cæsar de B. C. l. 2. c. 20. Liv. l. 25. c. 14. et l. 33. c. 38. et l. 34. c. 47. Suet. Cai. c. 56. n. 4. et Suet. Juv. 4.

<sup>i</sup> Dio, l. 55. p. 565, A. Tac. Hist. l. 2. c. 93, prop. fin. Joseph. de Bell. Jud. l. 3. c. 4. §. 2. Appian has instances of cohorts of this sort, which had yet more men. Vid. Savil's View of certain military Matters, p. 219.

<sup>k</sup> Vegetius indeed, who lived more than three hundred years after the time we are speaking of, says, that the first cohort of every legion consisted of a thousand men, and those chosen ones. Vid. de Re Militari, l. 2. c. 6, pr. So probably it was when he wrote; but we have not the least hint of this in any more ancient author, which we must certainly have met with, had it been the practice in their time. That the first cohort was more depended on than any other, is evident from those words of Cæsar, *Duabusque missis subsidio cohortibus, atque his primis legionum duarum*. *De Bell. Gal.* l. 5. c. 15. But this proceeded not from the greatness of their number, but from the choice of the men, and that their officers were the bravest, the oldest, and the most experienced of the whole legion. For which reason the centuries of this cohort were members of the council of war. Vid. Polyb. l. 6. p. 470, B. Cæs. de Bell. Gal. l. 5. c. 28. Lips. de Rom. Mil. l. 2. Dial. 4. Savil's View, p. 209, pr.

ber not to have read in any author of the tribune of a legionary cohort <sup>l</sup>, and without doubt such an expression must have been very improper. There were six tribunes to a legion <sup>m</sup>, and in each legion ten cohorts <sup>n</sup>. If I mistake not, the tribunes had authority equally over the whole legion, so far as their power reached <sup>o</sup>. But had the command been divided, there would have been a cohort and two-thirds of a cohort under each tribune. It would have been a great diminution therefore to have spoken of them as having authority over one cohort only.

We read, in the History of the Acts, of Cornelius a centurion at Cæsarea, of the band called *the Italian band* <sup>p</sup>. The Greek word is σπειρα, which signifies *a cohort*. He was one of the centurions of the

<sup>l</sup> They are always termed Tribuni Militum, or, if the author had a mind to be more particular, Tribuni militum de legione 2dæ, *Liv.* l. 33. c. 38. Trib. mil. tertię legionis, l. 41. c. 3. 4tæ legionis, l. 34. c. 46. Tribuni legionis quintę, *Hirt. de Bell. Afr.* c. 28. Tribunus militum 10æ legionis, c. 54. L. Atius tribunus primus 2dæ legionis, *Liv.* l. 41. c. 3. Vid. et l. 25. c. 14. l. 41. c. 1. et 2. l. 45. c. 32. Suet. Otho, c. 10. n. 2. But the commanders of six independent cohorts, placed in garrison by Varro at Cadiz, Cæsar calls Tribuni cohortium. *De Bell. Civ.* l. 2. c. 20. n. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Polyb. l. 6. p. 473, B. et 478, B. In Vegetius's time there were as many tribunes as cohorts in a legion. Vid. l. 2. c. 14. But there is not the least footstep of any such thing in the authors who wrote about the time we are speaking of.

<sup>n</sup> Jul. Frontin. de Stratagem. l. 1. c. 6, pr. Cæs. de Bell. Gal. l. 6. c. 7.

<sup>o</sup> Therefore Horace says, Quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno. *Sat.* l. 1. 6. v. 48. They usually governed by turns, two at a time. Polyb. l. 6. p. 479, A. et 482, A.

<sup>p</sup> Acts x. 1.

Italian cohort. There having been a legion of this name, called *legio Italica*, most learned men have been hereby induced to understand it as importing that he was a centurion of one of the cohorts belonging to the Italian legion<sup>q</sup>. But there is not the least ground for this interpretation. Had St. Luke meant this, no doubt he would have said that he was a centurion of the Italian legion, or of one of the cohorts in that legion, which was the easy, natural, and usual way of speaking<sup>r</sup>. But this he

<sup>q</sup> Vid. Grot. in loc. Samuel Basnage acknowledges that this legion had not yet a being, but thinks that St. Luke, by a prolepsis, calls the legion he then served in, *the Italic legion*, because at the time he wrote his history, Cornelius was a centurion in the legion so named. Vid. Ann. p. 513. n. 10.

<sup>r</sup> L. Fabius centurio legionis 8væ, *Cæs. de Bell. Gal.* l. 7. c. 47. M. Petreius ejusdem legionis centurio, c. 50. T. Salienus centurio legionis 5æ, *Hirt. de Bell. Afr.* c. 28. Centurio legionis 14æ, c. 45. Duodecimæ legionis—quartæ cohortis omnibus centurionibus occisis, *Cæs. de Bell. Gal.* l. 2. c. 25. Tertiæ cohortis centuriones, (legionis sub Q. Cicerone in Nerviiis,) l. 5. c. 43, prop. fin. Omnibus primæ cohortis (legionis nonæ) centurionibus interfectis, *de Bell. Civ.* l. 3. c. 64, fin. Centuriones qui jam primis ordinibus appropinquarent, T. Pulsio et L. Varenus, *de Bell. Gal.* l. 5. c. 44, pr. The first orders or centuries always made up the first cohort. Ab octavis ordinibus ad primipilum se transducere pronuntiavit. *De Bell. Civ.* l. 3. c. 53. By comparing this with Suet. Jul. c. 68. 4, 5, 6. it appears that the valiant Scæva, who had received a hundred and twenty or two hundred and thirty of the enemy's darts on his shield in the defence of a little tower against Pompey in one day, was at that time a centurion of the eighth cohort of the sixth legion under Cæsar. Vid. *de Bell. Gall.* l. 6. c. 40. n. 7. It was usual also to describe the centurions as they were placed over the *triarii*, *principes*, or *hastati*. And this St. Luke, who had been at Rome, could not be a stranger to. There were three maniples in every cohort, *manipulus triariorum*, *man. principum*, and *man. hastatorum*. Over each of these maniples were two



could not say, because there was no such legion then existing<sup>s</sup>. When he says, a centurion of the Italian cohort, no doubt he means a distinct, separate cohort, which went under that name<sup>t</sup>.

That there were cohorts even of Romans, distinct from the legionary cohorts, I mean besides the prætorian and city cohorts, is as clear from Strabo and Tacitus as words can make it. Strabo, speaking of the Roman forces in Egypt, says, there are three legions, of which one is placed in the city, the other two in the country. Besides these, there are nine cohorts of Romans, three in the city, three near the borders of Æthiopia in Syene, and three in another part of the country<sup>u</sup>. In his description of Syene, a little after, he says again, There are placed here

centurions: the first chosen had the precedence, and commanded the order or century on the right hand, and was called Primus centurio, *Liv.* l. 7. c. 41. Centurio primi pili, *Liv.* 2. 27. Cæs. B. G. 3, 5. Vell. Patere. l. 2. c. 78, fin. Primipilus, *Liv.* 8. 8. Cæs. B. G. 2, 25. or Princeps prior. B. C. 3. 64, fin. Princeps primus, *Liv.* 25. 14. or hastatus primus. *Flor.* l. 1. c. 18. n. 8. Minucius 4tæ legionis primus hastatus. *Oros.* l. 4. c. 1. p. 222. Cæs. B. C. l. 1. c. 46. And of the inferior cohorts we read, Tertio anno virtutis causa mihi T. Quintius Flaminius decumum ordinem hastatum assignavit, *Liv.* 42. 34. Nasennius octavum principem duxit, *Tull. ad Brut.* ep. 8.

<sup>s</sup> The conversion of Cornelius happened at the end of the reign of Caius, or the beginning of Claudius; but the Italic legion was raised by Nero, as we are expressly informed by Dio, l. 55. p. 564, E.; and Suetonius, as I think, confirms it, *Ner.* c. 19. 4. We read not of the Italic legion before this time, but after is frequent mention made of it by Tacitus, *Hist.* l. 1. c. 59. et 64. l. 2. c. 41. et 100. et l. 3, 14.

<sup>t</sup> As much as Tacitus, when he says, Sempronius Densus centurio prætoriæ cohortis, *Hist.* l. 1. c. 43, pr.

<sup>u</sup> L. 17. p. 797, B.

three cohorts of Romans for a guard<sup>x</sup>. Tacitus, speaking of the legacies of the emperor Augustus, says, that he gave to the legionary soldiers, and to such cohorts as were composed of Roman citizens, three hundred *nummi*, i. e. two pounds eight shillings and five pence farthing a man<sup>y</sup>. He had mentioned the prætorian cohorts before, to whom Augustus left a much larger legacy. Had he hereby meant the urban cohorts, no doubt he would have named them. They were but three<sup>z</sup>, too small a body to be joined with the legionaries, and described by such a periphrasis. Besides, it is evident from Suetonius<sup>a</sup> and Dio<sup>b</sup>, that they had five hundred *nummi*, i. e. four pound and eight pence three farthings a man. Tacitus, in other parts of his history, also plainly distinguishes between the legionary and other cohorts<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>x</sup> P. 817, D. Vid. p. 819, C.

<sup>y</sup> Prætoriarum cohortium militibus singula nummum millia, legionariis aut cohortibus civium Romanorum trecenos nummos viritim dedit. *Ann.* l. 1. c. 8. n. 6. Vid. Jac. Gronov. not.

<sup>z</sup> Tac. *Ann.* l. 4. c. 5. n. 4.

<sup>a</sup> Aug. 102. 4. n. 24.

<sup>b</sup> L. 56. p. 590, fin. et 591, pr.

<sup>c</sup> We read of separate cohorts in the Roman army, even from the early days of the republic. The brave Siccus led a cohort of eight hundred, Dionys. Hal. l. 10. c. 43. Some cohorts of veterans followed T. Quinctius the consul, Liv. l. 3. c. 69, pr. fin. At another time, Seniorum etiam cohortes factæ, Liv. l. 10. c. 21. And it is no uncommon thing, in the accounts given us of the Roman armies, to read of various cohorts over and above the legions, which cannot well be understood of any but Roman cohorts. Vid. Cæs. de Bell. Gal. l. 5. c. 24. de Bell. Civ. l. 3. c. 88, 89. Tac. H. l. 1. c. 59, 60. Vid. Not. ad num. 7. *Ann.* l. 15. c. 10. Lips. de Rom. Mil. l. 1. Dial. 8. With such separate or independent cohorts at the decline of the republic, and beginning of the empire, they garrisoned the frontier places, as we have al-

I cannot therefore make the least doubt but that there was at Cæsarea such a cohort as we have been describing, composed perhaps chiefly of Italians, and from thence taking the name of the Italian cohort<sup>d</sup>. That these separate cohorts should have names given them as well as the legions, to distinguish them from each other, was nothing more than necessary. Accordingly, we read in Tacitus of *cohors*

ready seen both from Strabo and Cæsar, and as might be further confirmed from Tacitus. Vid. Ann. l. 15. c. 10. et l. 3. c. 47. et c. 41. Andecavos Acilius, excita cohorte, quæ Lugduni præsidium agitabat, coercuit. Turonii legionario milite oppressi. Et l. 12. 38. Legionarias cohortes exstruendis apud Siluras præsidii relictas, circumfundunt. Ac ni cito vicis et castellis proximis subventum foret, i. e. Unless the cohorts, which were garrisoned in the neighbouring towns and fortifications, had come immediately to their relief, the legionary cohorts had been cut to pieces.

<sup>d</sup> The learned Dr. Lightfoot is of opinion that this cohort was the lifeguard of the procurator, and therefore were Italians, vol. 1. p. 843. That it was no unusual thing for the governors of provinces to have such a guard, appears from Cæs. de Bell. Gal. l. 1. c. 40. n. 15. where, professing that he would venture himself with the tenth legion only, he says, Sibique eam prætoriam cohortem futuram. Kennet says, that it was the institution of Scipio Numantinus, Antiq. of Rome, p. 191, pr. But many years before this, Scipio Africanus had such a cohort, as his own words will evince; Tribunis edicit, ut ubi prætorio dimisso signa concinissent, extemplo educerent e castris legiones, Liv. l. 30. c. 5. And so had Postumius the dictator some ages before; Cohorti suæ, quæ de delecta manu præsidii causa circa se habebat. Liv. l. 2. c. 20. We meet with the phrase Cohorti prætorix, Tull. in Verrem, l. 1. c. 14. Asconius interprets it, Comitibus consularibus; and so it seems to be understood in other parts of Tully's Speech against Verres, Vid. l. 2. c. 10. (27) et Epist. ad Quint. l. 1. ep. 1. c. 4, pr. However, had it been altogether unusual for the governors of provinces to have entertained such a guard, this phrase or way of speaking had been without foundation. Sylla, Mark Antony, and Octavius Cæsar, had such a guard. Vid. Savil's View, p. 219.

*duodevicesima*<sup>e</sup>, and of *cohors septima decima*<sup>f</sup>,

<sup>e</sup> Hist. l. i. c. 64. n. 7.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. c. 80. n. 1. The auxiliary or social forces were divided into cohorts, and in reading the Roman historians it is not always possible to distinguish between them and the independent Roman cohorts we are speaking of, especially where cohorts are named in general without any further description. But we may very safely pronounce that Cohors duodevicesima and Cohors septima decima were not auxiliaries. For as we read not of such names given to any auxiliary cohorts, so we find them (if described at all) always described by the name of the place where they were raised, or by the peculiar arms they bore. Quatuor et triginta cohortes, ut nomina gentium, aut species armorum forent discretæ, *Tac. Hist.* l. 2. c. 89. Thus we read of Cohors cetratorum, and Cohortes cetratæ, *Cæs. B. C.* l. i. c. 39. et 55. et 70. et 75. Præmissis Gallorum, Lusitanorum, Britannorumque cohortibus. *Tac. Hist.* l. i. c. 70. Cohortes duas universas Camertium, *Tull. pro Balbo*, 22. (50.) Cohortem Marsorum, *Liv.* l. 33. c. 38. Cohors Peligna, l. 25. c. 14. Cohortes duas sociorum Lucanam Suessanamque, l. 10. c. 33. The soldiers raised also in their own colonies, though Roman citizens, and distinguished from the auxiliaries, (as you may see by those words of Livy, M. Junius consul in provinciam Galliam transgressus, auxiliis protinus per civitates Galliæ, militibusque colonis imperatis, l. 41. c. 5.) yet were frequently in independent cohorts, which took their names from the colonies where they were raised. We have before observed, that Cæsar mentions Duæ coh. colonicæ, *Livy*, Coh. Placentina, l. 41. c. 1. Coh. Firmana et cohors Cremonensis, l. 44. c. 40. which doubtless took their names from the colonies of Placentia, Firmum, and Cremona, vid. *Liv.* l. 27. c. 11. And this, by the way, I take to be a new and clear proof of separate, independent cohorts of Roman citizens.

As the two cohorts named Duodevicesima and Decima septima, could not be auxiliaries, so neither could they be legionary cohorts. It is true, the legionary cohorts were named from their number, as we have already seen from Cæsar's Commentaries, 12æ legionis quartæ cohortis, et primæ cohortis legionis nonæ, et tertiæ cohortis legionis sub Q. Cicerone; and Tully also mentions Primam cohortem, *ad Att.* l. 5. ep. 20. But as there were

which probably was the cohort we have mentioned before, as placed by the emperor Claudius at Ostia for the prevention of fire.

It appears to me, upon a careful examination of Josephus, that all the Roman forces which were ordered in Judæa during the time it was a Roman province, before the destructive war broke out which ended in the ruin of the city and temple, were this sort of separate, independent cohorts. He tells us, that at the death of Herod Agrippa, which happened about four years after the conversion of Cornelius, there were five cohorts at Cæsarea, composed of persons who were citizens of Cæsarea or of Sebaste. He mentions these in particular, because of the insults they were guilty of towards the deceased Agrippa and his family, to whom they had been under great obligations<sup>g</sup>. Afterwards, upon the occasion of the quarrel between the Jews and other inhabitants of Cæsarea, he says, that the most of those who served there as soldiers under the Romans were of Cæsarea or Sebaste<sup>h</sup>. This implies that they were not all so, but that there might be one or more cohorts of other nations; of which the Italian cohort, mentioned by St. Luke, might be one,

no more than ten cohorts in a legion, the name of a legionary cohort could never exceed that number, *Decima cohors erat infima*. Since then there were cohorts which went by the name of *Duodevicesima* and *Decima septima*, it is not only a demonstration that there were such independent cohorts as I am pleading for, but that there were a considerable number of them, and that they often took their names from the order in which they were raised, as did the legions themselves.

<sup>g</sup> Antiq. l. 19. c. 9. §. 1, 2.

<sup>h</sup> Ἐπὶ τῷ τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίους ἐκεῖσε στρατευσάντων Καίσαρ εἶναι καὶ Σεβαστηνούς. Antiq. l. 20. c. 8. §. 7.

if not before removed; for this was thirteen or fourteen years after the conversion of Cornelius.

Before this, it is said of Cumanus the procurator, that taking the Sebastene horse, and four cohorts of foot, he assisted the Samaritans against the Jews <sup>i</sup>. In the time of Florus the procurator, he tells us there came two cohorts from Cæsarea to Jerusalem <sup>k</sup>: and after the war broke out, when Titus came to his father Vespasian at Ptolemais, it is said, five cohorts from Cæsarea joined them <sup>l</sup>. He tells us of another cohort at the same time in garrison at Ascalon <sup>m</sup>: and the cohort left by Florus at Jerusalem had been some time before basely murdered by the Jews, and that on their sabbath <sup>n</sup>. Thus we find frequent mention of cohorts; and although we read in Josephus of several legions in Syria, we find not an account of any one which was quartered in Judæa during this time, or indeed that did so much as enter it.

Vitellius marched with two legions out of Syria to make war upon Aretas king of Arabia, by order

<sup>i</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 6. §. 1. Τέσσαρες τάγματα. This is a word often used by Greek writers to signify *legions*: that it cannot be so understood here, is evident from the circumstances of the case. And Josephus uses it elsewhere also to signify *cohort* particularly, l. 19. c. 1. §. 15. where he calls the body of German guards τάγμα. Compare it with Suet. Aug. 49. 3. et ibi Not. et Galb. 12. 4.

<sup>k</sup> De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 15. §. 3.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. l. 3. c. 4. §. 2. The army there described consisted of three legions and twenty-three cohorts, ten of which cohorts had one thousand foot each, the other thirteen six hundred foot and a hundred and twenty horse. The account of the auxiliaries follows after.

<sup>m</sup> De Bell. Jud. l. 3. c. 2. §. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. l. 2. c. 17. §. 10.



of the emperor Tiberius; but when they came to Ptolemais, he yielded to the intercession of the Jews, that they should not go through Judæa<sup>o</sup>. Petronius also took two legions from Syria, and came to Ptolemais; but the soldiers halted there, and he with his friends and servants only went to Tiberias, where the Jews prevailed with him to delay the execution of the order he had received from the emperor Caius to set up his image in the temple, and the legions proceeded no further<sup>p</sup>.

The emperor Claudius was so highly offended with the five cohorts, which were composed of the citizens of Cæsarea and Sebaste, for insulting the deceased Agrippa and his family, that he ordered Fadus the procurator to send them to Pontus in order to serve there, and to choose the same number of soldiers out of the Roman legions in Syria to supply their place in Cæsarea<sup>q</sup>. This not only shews us that the legions were quartered in Syria, but also teaches us that the separate cohorts we have been mentioning were sometimes formed out of the choice of the legionary soldiers; and it is not improbable that they were usually so<sup>r</sup>. The consequence of this must have been, that the independent cohorts of Roman citizens were esteemed more honourable than the legions; and thus it manifestly was with regard to the prætorian and urban cohorts<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>o</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 6. Hudson, but should be 5. §. 3.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. c. (wrongly numbered 9.) 8. §. 2, 3, &c.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. l. 19. c. 9. §. 2, prop. fin.

<sup>r</sup> Thus Cæsar says that he would make the tenth legion his prætorian cohort. De B. G. l. 1. c. 40.

<sup>s</sup> This appears from the largeness of their pay, and the legacies of Augustus, Tac. Ann. l. 1. c. 17. p. 34. l. ult. Dio, l. 53. p. 503, B. Tac. Hist. l. 1. c. 87. Suet. Aug. c. 102. n. 4.

When the war broke out, Cestius took from Antioch the twelfth legion complete, and two thousand chosen men out of the other legions, and six cohorts, which probably might be such cohorts as we have been mentioning<sup>t</sup>. Indeed before this we read, that when Fadus did by the emperor's order make a demand that the vestments of the high priest should be deposited in the castle of Antonia, Longinus the procurator of Syria came to Jerusalem, and with him a great force, to prevent the tumults and disorders which he feared might arise from such a demand<sup>u</sup>. The words here are very general, πολλὴν ἐπαγόμενος δύναμιν. They signify, unquestionably, a greater number of soldiers than were usually brought to Jerusalem: but as it is not said that he came immediately from Syria, it is possible he might come only from Cæsarea, and bring with him the cohorts from thence. Or if he came from Syria, a considerable number of horse and light-armed foot might attend him, and he might take the cohorts from Cæsarea in his way. Had he brought a legion with him, I think we may be very certain that Josephus would have expressed it. He who gives so particular an account that the chief of the Jewish nation met Vitellius at Ptolemais, and interceded with him, that the legions might not march through their country, because it was contrary to their laws to permit images (of which there were many in their legionary ensigns) to be brought into it<sup>x</sup>, would he pass over this so slightly, and say nothing of any opposition that was made to it<sup>y</sup>? And was it possible there

<sup>t</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 18. §. 9.

<sup>u</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 1. §. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. l. 18. c. (6. Hud. for) 5. §. 3.

<sup>y</sup> Read the opposition that was made to Pilate, when he

should not be great opposition made to it? and that in a reign when the Jews were highly favoured, and carried almost every point they asked <sup>z</sup>?

Upon the whole, I think there is clear proof that the cohorts quartered in Judæa were separate, independent cohorts <sup>a</sup>; and that St. Luke has spoken most justly and properly in calling Cornelius a centurion of the Italian cohort, and Julius a centurion of the Augustal cohort <sup>b</sup>, (which not improbably was a cohort of the Sebastenes, mentioned by Josephus,) and Lysias the chiliarch. We have rendered it *chief captain of the band* <sup>c</sup>, but in the Greek it is *χιλίαρχος*, i. e. tribune or prefect of the cohort which was then at Jerusalem: for ordinarily there was but one cohort quartered at Jerusalem. Upon the great feasts,

brought the emperor's image from Samaria to Jerusalem among the military ensigns, l. 18. c. 4. Hud. for 3. §. 1. It is there said that former governors had caused their forces to march into Jerusalem with ensigns that had no such ornaments, i. e. no images of any kind. It seems to me to have been entirely arbitrary, and wholly in the breast of the commanding officer, what ensigns were made use of in the separate and independent cohorts. We read of ten thousand men under one ensign, who were the life-guard of Octavius Cæsar in Appian, quoted by Savil, p. 219. But what was the legion without its eagle? Read also the cruel event of Herod's fixing a golden eagle upon the gate of the temple. Antiq. l. 17. c. 6. §. 2, 3. De Bell. l. 1. c. 33. §. 2, 3, &c.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Antiq. l. 19. c. 5 et 6. et l. 20. c. 1 et 5.

<sup>a</sup> There is a German professor who has wrote a dissertation upon this subject, and is of my opinion. His name is Schwarzzius of Altorf. I have endeavoured what I could, but have not been able to see his treatise. It was printed at Altorf, 1720. Vid. Wolf. Curæ. in Act. x. 1. Could I have procured it, I might, I believe, have spared much of the labour I have been at upon this point.

<sup>b</sup> Acts xxvii. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Acts xxi. 31.

and the apprehension of any commotion, doubtless there were more cohorts sent thither: for which reason there were frequent marchings of the soldiers between Jerusalem and Cæsarea<sup>d</sup>. But that there was ordinarily one cohort only at Jerusalem seems evident to me from what passed between Florus and the Jewish magistrates, when he left the city the last time, just before the war broke out. He told them of his departure, and offered to leave with them as strong a guard as they should desire. They undertook that all things would be secure and quiet if he would leave with them a cohort, but not that which had fought with the inhabitants; for the people could not but have an enmity to that cohort, by reason of what they had suffered. For Josephus tells us before, that Florus had ordered the soldiers to plunder part of the city, and kill all they met with. In the execution of which order, the lives of three thousand six hundred of the inhabitants were destroyed<sup>e</sup>. Florus agreed to the proposal, and having changed the cohort *as* they desired, returned with the rest of the forces to Cæsarea<sup>f</sup>. As it is not to be thought that the magistrates at such a time as this would have asked for a less guard than was usually placed at Jerusalem, so we may be very sure that if they had, Florus would not have consented to it. And by those words, ἀλλάξας τὴν σπεῖραν, *having changed the cohort, as the magistrates desired*, it should seem that it was not any part of the forces which Florus brought with him, but the

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Antiq. l. 18. c. 4. Hud. for 3. §. 1. De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 15. §. 3.

<sup>e</sup> De Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 14. §. 9.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. c. 15. §. 6.

cohort which was in garrison at Jerusalem that had done the mischief, and irritated the people.

§. 2. We read in the History of the Acts, that the owners of the maid which had the spirit of divination drew Paul and Silas to the magistrates, and accused them of troubling the city, and teaching customs which were unlawful for them to receive and observe, being Romans<sup>g</sup>. Persons who are in the least acquainted with the state of our colonies in the West Indies, cannot but know how much the price of a slave is increased by the profession he is of, the business he has learnt, and the capacity he is in of earning money. The ancient Greeks and Romans possessed slaves of all professions, philosophers<sup>h</sup>, rhetoricians, grammarians, physicians, as well as persons bred up to every sort of mechanic trade<sup>i</sup>. Among the rest, they sometimes happened to have slaves that were astrologers, or magicians, or diviners<sup>k</sup>. Ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, or those who had the spirit of Python, were doubtless very rare, and the purchase of such a one must have been exceeding high. The maidservant here mentioned, you see, is represented as having more than one owner. Her

<sup>g</sup> Ch. xvi. 19—21.

<sup>h</sup> Thus was the celebrated Plato, Diog. Laert. l. 3. n. 19. Sen. Epist. 47. p. 117. Vid. Plut. in Dion. Corn. Nep. in Dion. cit. in Not. Menag. in Diog. Laert. Thus was the famous Diogenes the cynic, being sold to Xenocrates the Corinthian, Diog. Laert. l. 6. n. 29, 30, 36. Sen. Ep. 47. p. 117. and Epictetus the Stoic. Vid. Fabric. Bib. Græc.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Pignor. de Servis, et Popma de Oper. Serv. Diogenes tells Xenocrates, who bought him, that a physician or a pilot, though a slave, must be obeyed. That in like manner he ought to hearken to him, though his slave. Diog. Laert. l. 6. c. 30, 36.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Pignor. de Serv. p. 355.



price, it is likely, was too great to be advanced by a single person: at least no one in prudence cared to risk so large a sum upon the uncertainty of a life: for though she brought much gain, how soon might it be cut off by her decease!

There were two things therefore which deeply affected her owners upon St. Paul's having cast out the spirit; the disappointment of their hopes and the loss of their capital. This person would now sell for no more than a common servant-maid. Unquestionably they thought that no small injury was done them, and were highly provoked. They hale Paul and Silas therefore to the magistrates. But what can they accuse them of? St. Paul had herein broken no Roman law. The casting out a spirit of divination was a thing unknown, unheard of among the Romans, and therefore we may be sure there was no law to provide against it. For this reason they are obliged to take up with general accusations, such as troubling the city, and teaching customs which it was not lawful for the Romans to receive. The name of Jews was generally odious among the heathen<sup>1</sup>, so that they readily believed any crimes imputed to them. The masters of the damsel therefore open their indictment with declaring that the persons accused were Jews.

No doubt St. Paul had taught in this, as in all other cities of the heathen, that they should turn from the worship of idols unto the living God, who

<sup>1</sup> *Suspiciosa ac maledica civitate*, spoken of the nation of the Jews, Tull. pro Flac. c. 28. *Judæa gens contumelia numinum insignis*, Plin. l. 13. §. 9. p. 69. *Dum Assyrios penes, Medosque et Persas oriens fuit, despectissima pars servientium*. And a little after, *Teterrimam gentem*, Tac. Hist. l. 5. c. 8. p. 358.



made heaven and earth. How far the teaching this was punishable by the Roman laws is not now so clear. That there were laws forbidding the introducing of strange deities, or new rites and ceremonies, in the public worship, is most certain<sup>m</sup>. Notwithstanding, there seems to have been a toleration, both at Rome and throughout the whole empire, for every person to worship what gods he pleased, and in what manner he thought fit, at his own home in private<sup>n</sup>. Nor does there seem to have been any law against the instructing persons in private in the ceremonies and worship of any deity. The Jews, we know, made many proselytes at Rome itself<sup>o</sup>, as well as in other parts of the empire.

However, whether the preaching of the apostle was a crime against the Roman law or not, the magistrates of Philippi heard no proofs of the things alleged, nor gave the prisoners leave to make any defence; but, seeing the populace enraged against them, without more ado stripped them, beat them, and committed them to close confinement. It is not improbable that the magistrates might have been before informed of what had happened to the ser-

<sup>m</sup> Liv. l. 39. c. 16. p. 1156. Tull. de Leg. l. 2. c. 8. et 10. See the advice of Mæcenas to Augustus, Dio, l. 52. p. 490, D. and how far he followed it, Suet. Aug. c. 93, pr.

<sup>n</sup> Καὶ ὁ πάντων μάλιστα ἔγωγε τεθαύμακα, καίπερ μυρίων ὄσων εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐληλυθόντων ἔθνων, ΟἷΣ ΠΟΛΛὴ ΑΝΑΓΚΗ ΣΕΒΕΙΝ ΤΟΥΤΣ ΠΑΤΡΙΟΥΤΣ ΘΕΟΥΤΣ ΤΟΙΣ ΟΙΚΟΘΕΝ ΝΟΜΙΜΟΙΣ, οὐδενὸς εἰς ζῆλον ἐλήλυθε τῶν ξενικῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἢ πόλις δημοσίᾳ, ὁ πολλαῖς ἡδὲ συνέβη παθεῖν. Dionys. Hal. l. 2. c. 19. Omnes enim religione moventur, et deos patrios sibi retinendos arbitrantur. Cic. in Ver. quoted by Dr. Whitby on Acts xvi. 21.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Hor. Sat. l. 1, 4. v. ult. Juv. Sat. 14. v. 96, &c. Pers. Sat. 5. v. 179, &c. Jos. Antiq. l. 18. c. 4. §. 5.

vant-maid; might impute the change wrought in her to some wicked magical arts; might think it no small injury done to her owners, and looking upon Paul and Silas as mean and contemptible persons<sup>p</sup>, and seeing the whole city set against them, and demanding their punishment, they might judge it the most prudent part to act as they did, in order to appease and satisfy the multitude.

§. 3. The magistrates here are called ἄρχοντες<sup>q</sup>, and στρατηγοί<sup>r</sup>. The word ἄρχοντες signifies rulers or governors in general; but στρατηγοί is the word used by the Greeks to denote the Roman prætors. The proper name of the magistrates in a Roman colony is *duumviri*, who answer to the consuls at Rome in the same manner as *decuriones* to the senate. Tully informs us, that the *duumviri* of Capua called themselves prætors, and had lictors going before them, not with sticks or staves, but with the fasces or rods, in the same manner as the prætors had at Rome; and thinks it not improbable, that in a few years they would affect the name of consuls<sup>s</sup>. I make no doubt but that the example set by Capua soon spread, and it became common in other colo-

<sup>p</sup> It is very likely that it was usual for them to chastise slaves, and persons who were esteemed of a mean and servile condition, in this hasty manner. Even the municipal magistrates had a power to chastise slaves, l. 12. ff. de Jurisd. Vid. et Huber. Dissert. l. 1. Diss. 1. c. 6. p. 37. et Diss. 2. c. 3. p. 54.

<sup>q</sup> Ver. 19.

<sup>r</sup> Ver. 20.

<sup>s</sup> Cum cæteris in coloniis duumviri appellentur, hi se prætores appellari volebant. Quibus primus annus hanc cupiditatem attulisset, nonne arbitramini paucis annis fuisse consulum nomen appetituros? Deinde anteibant lictores, non cum bacillis, sed, ut hic prætoribus anteeunt, cum fascibus duobus. *De Leg. Agrar.* 34. (93.)

nies also to call their magistrates prætors. No wonder if the Greeks therefore, who were great masters in the art of flattery, and never diminished or lessened the honours due to any, gave them all the name of στρατηγοί, or prætors. That they did so, is very evident from the book of Modestinus the Roman lawyer, *de Excusationibus*, which he wrote in the Greek language, wherein, speaking of the magistrates of colonies, he calls them στρατηγοί<sup>t</sup>. And Theophilus, a Greek interpreter of the laws, does the same<sup>u</sup>. If the Roman lawyers give them that name, we may be sure it was only because it had been the prevailing practice.

§. 4. As we have seen from Tully that the *duumviri* of Capua, or prætors, as they called themselves, had their lictors with the fasces going before them, so we find in St. Luke, that the magistrates of Philippi had also their ῥαβδούχοι<sup>x</sup>, which is the word used by the Greeks to signify the Roman lictors. These were officers who constantly attended the chief Roman magistrates, to be ready upon all occasions to seize and chastise offenders. It is said the magistrates of Philippi *rent off the clothes of Paul and Silas*<sup>y</sup>, i. e. they ordered the lictors or officers to do it. Nothing more common than to impute that to the magistrate which is done by his order<sup>z</sup>.

<sup>t</sup> In l. 6. §. 16. ff. de Excusat. Tut. et l. 15. §. 9. eod. Vid. Hub. l. 1. Diss. 2. p. 51.

<sup>u</sup> Ad Tit. 20. §. 4. l. 1. Instit. Vid. Hub. p. 53.

<sup>x</sup> Ver. 35. 38.

<sup>y</sup> Ver. 22.

<sup>z</sup> Thus, although it is said, ver. 22, that the magistrates commanded them to be beaten, yet, ver. 23, it is said the magistrates laid many stripes upon them, and cast them into prison; and, ver. 33, the magistrates have beat us openly, and have cast us

It was the custom to strip malefactors before they beat or scourged them. They did not give the offender leave to pull off his own clothes, nor would they suffer the officers to untie, unhasp, or unbutton them, and to take them off in a regular way; but they were torn or rent off their backs in the hastiest manner. The word περιρρήξαντες, made use of by St. Luke, signifies this, and is the very word made use of by other Greek authors<sup>a</sup>; and a word of the same import, signifying force and violence, by the Latins<sup>b</sup>.

§. 5. The magistrates having given strict charge to the gaoler to keep Paul and Silas safely, it is said he thrust them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks<sup>c</sup>. The inner prison goes by a great variety of names among ancient authors<sup>d</sup>, and is in one place of the Roman law called *sedis intimæ tenebræ*<sup>e</sup>. It was dark as well as inward, remote both from light and air. The stocks, called in the Greek ξύλον, in Latin *nervus*, or *cippus*, was an engine so contrived, that the prisoner sitting on the ground, his legs were put into two holes, which were drawn asunder to what degree the gaoler pleased; so that the person fastened therein

into prison. Thus it is said, Philip king of Macedonia, ἐμαστήγωσεν, scourged Aphthonetus, and ἀπέκτεινεν, executed, or put to death, Archidamus. Ælian. Var. Hist. l. 14. c. 49. Vid. Periz. notas.

<sup>a</sup> Plut. in Mario et in Camillo, citat. Grot. in loc.

<sup>b</sup> Lacerantibus vestem lictoribus, *Liv.* 28. Scissa veste, *Tac. Hist.* l. 4. c. 27. Fasces lictori auferentem et sua vestimenta scindentem, quia tardius scindebantur aliena, *Senec. de Ira*, l. 1. c. 16. p. 21, pr. Vid. Grot. *ibid.*

<sup>c</sup> Ver. 23, 24.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Wolf. *Cur.* in loc.

<sup>e</sup> L. 1. circa med. C. de Custod. Reor. Tenebris vinculisque mandare. *Tull. in Cat.* 4. (10.) 5.

often lay in the greatest torture and misery. Mention is made of this engine by many of the ancient authors <sup>f</sup>.

§. 6. We read afterwards that the gaoler would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoner had been fled <sup>g</sup>. The cause of this sudden and desperate resolution was the severe punishment he dreaded. For by the Roman law the gaoler was to undergo the same punishment which the malefactors, who escaped by his negligence, were to have suffered <sup>h</sup>. And it was a usual thing both with Greeks and Romans, in any great distress, immediately to rid themselves of their fears and lives together <sup>i</sup>. Even the philosophers themselves countenanced and encouraged this practice <sup>k</sup>.

§. 7. The magistrates, having appeased the people by scourging and imprisoning Paul and Silas, had

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Grot. in loc. et Wolf. Cur.

<sup>g</sup> Ver. 27.

<sup>h</sup> L. 4. C. de Custod. Reor. Vid. et l. 8. et 12, ff. eod.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Tull. pro Cluen. 61. (171.)

<sup>k</sup> By their doctrine. Vid. Sen. de Prov. c. 2, prop. fin. et c. 6. per tot. Epist. 58, prop. fin. Quemadmodum navem eligam navigaturus, et domum habitaturus, ita mortem utique, qua sum exiturus e vita, Epist. 70. It was the opinion of the Stoics in general, Εὐλόγως ἐξάξειν ἑαυτὸν τοῦ βίου τὸν σοφὸν——καὶ ἐν σκληροτέρᾳ γένηται ἀληθδόνι, ἢ πηρώσειν, ἢ νόσοις ἀνιάτοις. Diog. Laert. l. 7. c. 130, fin. Vid. Not. Menag. And of the Epicureans, Æquo animo e vita, cum ea non placeat, tanquam e theatro, exeamus. Tull. de Fin. l. 1. c. 15. Vid. et c. 19. et Diog. Laert. l. 10. c. 124—127. et 139. And by their practice. Thus it is said that Menippus ἐπ' ἀθυμίας βρόχῳ τὸν βίον μετελλάξει. Diog. Laert. l. 6. c. 100. Metrocles, ἑαυτὸν πνίξας. Ibid. c. 95. Zeno, ἀποπνίξας ἑαυτόν. Id. l. 7. c. 28, fin. Cleanthes, ἀποσχόμενον τροφῆς τελευτήσας. C. 176. See what is said of the death of Pythagoras, Diog. Laert. l. 8. c. 19. of Aristotle, l. 5. c. 6. of Empedocles, l. 8. 69. and of Democritus, Athenæus, l. 2. cit. Menag. in not. ad Diog. Laert. l. 9. 43.



attained their chief end. No doubt they thought the prisoners had undergone sufficient punishment, since no crime was proved against them, and therefore sent an order to the gaoler the next morning to discharge them. But St. Paul judged it reasonable that the magistrates should be made sensible of their rashness and injustice, that it might be a caution to them for the future not to give way to popular clamour, and suffer themselves to be borne down by the violence of the multitude, so as to injure and oppress the innocent. He therefore says to the gaoler and lictors who brought the order, *They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out*<sup>1</sup>.

It is here asked, Why St. Paul did not plead his privilege sooner, in order to prevent the punishment? Why did he not declare himself a Roman while the lictors were stripping him, as he did at another time to the centurion, while they were binding him with thongs<sup>m</sup>? When St. Paul spake to the centurion he was safely lodged in the castle, freed from the bustle and hurry of the multitude, and had time sufficient to tell his case in the coolest and most deliberate manner. But at Philippi the execution was so hasty, that he had not time to say any thing that might make for his defence; and the noise and confusion were so great, that had he cried out with never so loud a voice that he was a Roman, he might reasonably believe that he should not be regarded. Seeing also the fury of the multitude, for

<sup>1</sup> Ver. 37.<sup>m</sup> Acts xxii. 25.



immediately upon the accusation it is said, *the multitude rose up together against them*<sup>n</sup>; it is not improbable he might think it most advisable to submit to the sentence pronounced, however unjust, in order to quiet the people, and prevent a greater evil. For he was in danger of being forced out of the hands of the magistrates, and torn in pieces. But, whatever were the true reasons which prevailed with St. Paul not to declare himself a Roman, or whatever it was that prevented the effect which such a declaration, if made, ought to have had, the overruling hand of Providence was herein plainly visible; for the conversion of the gaoler and his household was occasioned by the execution of this hasty and unjust sentence.

That it was unlawful to beat a Roman with rods, that it was much more so to beat him uncondemned, is evident from the Roman laws<sup>o</sup>, Tully<sup>p</sup>, and many

<sup>n</sup> Acts xvi. 22.

<sup>o</sup> Porcia and Sempronia, mentioned by Tully, pro Rabir. 3. (8.) in Ver. l. 5. 63, pr. (162.) Vid. et Alex. ab Al. vol. 1. l. 3. c. 20. p. 770.

<sup>p</sup> Oblitosne igitur hos putatis esse, quemadmodum sit iste solitus virgis plebem Romanam concidere? *In Ver.* l. 1. 47. (122.) Cædebatur virgis in medio foro Messanæ civis Romanus, iudices; cum interea nullus gemitus, nulla vox alia istius miseri inter dolorem crepitumque plagarum audiebatur, nisi hæc, *Civis Romanus sum*. Hac se commemoratione civitatis omnia verbera depulsurum, cruciatumque a corpore dejecturum arbitrabatur. *In Ver.* l. 5. 62, fin. 63. (162, 163.) Vid. et (144. 147.) Facinus est vinciri civem Romanum, scelus verberari, prope parricidium necari. *In Ver.* l. 5. 66. (170.) Causa cognita multi possunt absolvi; incognita quidem condemnari nemo potest. *Ibid.* l. 1. 9. (25, fin.) Apollonium—indicta causa in vincla conjecit, l. 5. 8. (18.) Quæram, cur hunc eundem Apollonium, Verres idem, repente, nulla nova re allata, nulla defensione, sine causa de carcere emitti jus-

other authors<sup>q</sup>. St. Paul says, *They have beaten us openly*. It was deemed a great aggravation of any injury by the Roman law, that it was done in public, before the people<sup>r</sup>. He adds, *And now do they thrust us out privily?* Would they conceal the injury they have done us, by discharging us thus secretly? No, it is fitting, that as they have beaten us openly, so they should make an open declaration of our innocence. Let them therefore come to the prison, and publicly acknowledge the injustice they have done us, by giving us a dismissal in their own persons. That this and more might be sometimes done by the magistrates conscious of a false imprisonment appears from Lucian, who represents the governor of Egypt as speaking kindly to, and comforting Antiphilus and Demetrius for the punishment they had undergone by being unjustly detained in prison, and giving them a very large sum of money out of his own purse<sup>s</sup>.

serit? Tantumque in hoc crimine suspicionis esse affirmabo, &c. *Ibid.* 9. (22.)

<sup>q</sup> Traxeratque magnam senatus partem ut indefensum et inauditum dedi ad exitium postularent.—dari tempus, edi crimina, quamvis invisum ac nocentem, more tamen audiendum censebant. *Tac. Hist.* l. 2. c. 10. Inauditi atque indefensi tanquam innocentes perierant. *Ibid.* l. 1. c. 6. Vid. et Tertull. Apuleii. Salvian. cit. Grot. in loc.

<sup>r</sup> It was esteemed atrox injuria vestimentis scissis to have his clothes torn off, though he had suffered nothing in his body, l. 9. §. 1. ff. de Injur. But to undergo both, and that publicly, was a much higher aggravation, l. 7. §. 8. ff. de Injur. Pauli Sentent. l. 5. tit. 4. §. 10. Atrocitatem aut locus facit, aut tempus; locus, si in theatro aut in foro fiat—Si die festo ludorum, et conspiciente populo, injuria fiat, atrox est tempore. Vid. it. not. 32.

<sup>s</sup> Toxaris, p. 80. D. E.

It is afterwards said, that *the magistrates feared<sup>t</sup> when they heard that they were Romans, and came and besought them<sup>u</sup>, and brought them out, and desired them to depart out of the city<sup>x</sup>*. The magistrates, conscious of the iniquity they had committed, and the punishment they were liable to, might well be afraid. For Paul and Silas had their option, either to bring a civil action against them, or to indict them criminally for the injury done<sup>y</sup>. In either of which cases had they been cast, they were rendered infamous<sup>z</sup>, would be incapable of being any more in the magistracy<sup>a</sup>, and subjected to several other legal incapacities<sup>b</sup>, besides the punishment they were to undergo at the discretion of the judge, which in so atrocious an injury could not have been small<sup>c</sup>. The learned Grotius is of opinion

<sup>t</sup> In like manner it is said of Lysias the tribune, that he was afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him, Acts xxii. 29.

<sup>u</sup> It should rather have been translated *comforted them*, παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς, exactly of the same import with Lucian's παραμυθησάμενος. Toxar. ubi supra. They gave them good words, telling them how little they had deserved the treatment they had suffered, commended their patience, and said every thing that was proper to induce them to forgive the injury. Vid. Apul. Miles. 3. p. 50.

<sup>x</sup> Ver. 38, 39. <sup>y</sup> Vid. Voet. ad Pand. l. 47. tit. 10. §. 2. 13. 14. 15. 24. Huber. Dissert. l. 1. p. 57, 58.

<sup>z</sup> L. 1. ff. de his qui not. Infamia, l. 7. ff. de pub. Judiciis. Pauli Sent. l. 5. tit. 4. §. 9. Vid. not. 27—31.

<sup>a</sup> L. 5. ff. de Decurionibus et Pauli Sent. l. 1. tit. de Decur. §. 3.

<sup>b</sup> They could neither be nor appoint *procuratores* and *cognitores*, attorneys and solicitors. Pauli Sent. l. 1. tit. 2. §. 1. l. 1. §. 8. ff. de Postul. §. ult. Instit. de Exception. l. 15. §. 2. ff. de Probation. l. 7. ff. de Postul.

<sup>c</sup> In quos extra ordinem animadvertitur, ita ut prius ingruentis

that they might have been indicted for the crime *læsæ majestatis*, of treason against the Roman people. For he adds, such was the law, that the majesty of the Roman people was thought to be hurt by the hurting of a Roman citizen<sup>d</sup>. But I cannot find that he has sufficient authority for this.

It may possibly be asked, how St. Paul found so easy credit, when he asserted that he was a Roman, both here at Philippi, and in the castle of Antonia at Jerusalem? It is very probable that the magistrates of Philippi, when they sentenced him to be whipped without a hearing, took him for a person of a mean and servile condition. It is certain they treated him as such. It is not unlikely that Lysias the tribune might have the same notion of him when he ordered him the question. Is it to be supposed that they would readily believe one whom they looked upon as in so low a state of life? and that in a thing which was so manifestly for his present advantage? The answer to this is clear. It was at his own great peril, if he was afterwards found not to be what he had professed. Arrian tells us, that those who feigned themselves to be Roman citizens, when in truth they were not such, were severely punished<sup>e</sup>. And, what is yet more home to the

consilium pro modo commentæ fraudis pœna vindicetur exilii, aut metalli aut operis publici. *Pauli Sent.* l. 5. tit. 4. §. 8. l. ult. ff. de Injur. l. ult. ff. de privat. delict. The injury done St. Paul was dupliciter atrox, re et tempore. L. 7. §. 8. ff. de Injur. or tripliciter, according to *Pauli Sent.* l. 5. tit. 4. §. 10. Etiam ex lege Cornelia injuriarum actio civiliter moveri potest, condemnatione æstimatione judicis facienda. L. 37. §. 1. ff. de Injur. l. 7. §. 6. ff. eod.

<sup>d</sup> In ver. 38.

<sup>e</sup> Qui jus Romanæ civitatis mentiuntur, graviter puniuntur. *In*

present purpose, Suetonius informs us that the emperor Claudius beheaded such who usurped the Roman citizenship, and that in the place where they usually executed malefactors<sup>f</sup>. It was the eleventh year of this emperor's reign when St. Paul was imprisoned at Philippi; so that it was at no less peril than that of his life, and he was in danger of suffering the shameful death of a common malefactor, had he taken upon him to plead the privileges of a Roman citizen, and was not such in truth.

§. 8. It is said that Lysias the chief captain or tribune commanded that St. Paul should be *examined by scourging*<sup>g</sup>, that he might know what heinous crime he had been guilty of, which so highly provoked the people. The word which we translate *examine* signifies to examine by torture<sup>h</sup>. It was part of the Roman law to torture persons, in order to find out the truth<sup>i</sup>. That scourging was used by way of question or torture, is evident both from the Roman law and historians<sup>k</sup>; and indeed, I am apt to think, they commonly began the question with scourging<sup>l</sup>. It is added, *And as they*

*Epictet.* l. 3. c. 22. cit. Basnage, Ann. vol. 1. p. 627. n. 21, fin. Vid. et Tull. de Offic. l. 3. 11. (47).

<sup>f</sup> Civitatem Romanam usurpantes in campo Esquilino securi percussit. *Claud.* c. 25. n. 9. <sup>g</sup> Acts xxii. 24.

<sup>h</sup> Μάστιξιν ἀνετάξασθαι. Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxvii. 19. et Wolf. Cur. in loc.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Tit. de Quæstionibus in D. et C. Pauli Sent. l. 5. tit. 14. de Quæstionibus habendis. Suet. Aug. 19. 4. Tib. 19. 3. et 58. 2. et 62. 1, 2, 3. Cai. 32. 2. Claud. 34. 2. Ner. 35. 7. Tac. Ann. l. 1. c. 30. n. 5. et l. 14. c. 60. n. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxvii. 19.

<sup>l</sup> At illam non verbera, non ignes, non ira eo acrius torquentium, ne a fœmina spernerentur, pervicere. *Tac. Ann.* l. 15. c. 57.



*bound Paul with thongs*<sup>m</sup>. The words in the Greek are, ὧς προέτεινεν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱμᾶσιν, which signify not the binding him, but the shewing him the thongs wherewith they were to scourge him, and threatening him therewith<sup>n</sup>. For this undoubtedly was the method, to bring into their view, and lay before persons the instruments and engines of their torture, to try whether they would not confess the truth before they were actually applied<sup>o</sup>.

§. 9. The chief captain, we are told, *was afraid*, after he knew that Paul was a Roman, *because he had bound him*<sup>p</sup>. For it is before said, that *he had commanded him to be bound with two chains*<sup>q</sup>. Tully informs us that it was a crime to bind or imprison a Roman citizen<sup>r</sup>; he means, no doubt, uncondemned, as was the case we are now speaking of. It is well known, that one method of confinement among the Romans was by chaining the prisoner to a soldier<sup>s</sup>. The chain was fastened by one end to the wrist of the prisoner, by the other end to the wrist of the soldier. And sometimes they were fastened by two chains to two soldiers. In this manner was St. Paul conducted into the castle of Antonia, and lay there chained between two soldiers the first night<sup>t</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> Ver. 25.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Grot. in loc. et Wolf. Cur.

<sup>o</sup> Tormentorum adspexit et minas non tulere. Tac. Ann.

l. 15. c. 56. Voet. in ff. de Quæst. §. 2. ad fin. pag.

<sup>p</sup> Ver. 29.

<sup>q</sup> Acts xxi. 33.

<sup>r</sup> Facinus est vinciri civem Romanum. In Ver. l. 5. (170.)

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Tit. ff. de Custod. et Exhib. Reor. Alligatique sunt etiam qui alligaverunt, nisi tu forte leviores in sinistra catenam putas. Sen. de Tranq. c. 10. Eadem catena et custodiam et militum copulat. Sen. Epist. 5, prop. fin. Joseph. Antiq. l. 18. c. 7.

§. 5.

<sup>t</sup> Ver. 30.



Lysias discoursing with St. Paul in the castle, after having asked him whether he was a Roman, says, *With a great sum obtained I this freedom*<sup>u</sup>. That the freedom of the city of Rome was oftentimes sold, we may easily collect from a passage in Tully<sup>x</sup>; and that it was so more particularly in the reign of the emperor Claudius, Dio will inform us<sup>y</sup>.

We read that St. Paul<sup>z</sup> appealed from Festus the

<sup>u</sup> Ver. 27, 28.

<sup>x</sup> Ei Dolabella rogatu meo civitatem a Cæsare impetravit.—Cumque propter quosdam sordidos homines, qui Cæsaris beneficia vendebant, tabulam, in qua nomina civitate donatorum incisa essent, revelli jussisset; eidem Dolabellæ, me audiente, Cæsar dixit, nihil esse quod de Mega vereretur; beneficium suum in eo manere. *Ad Famil.* l. 13. ep. 36.

<sup>y</sup> Πολλοὶ παρὰ τῆς Μεσσαλίνης τῶν τε Καισαρείων ὠνοῦντο (τὴν πολιτείαν) καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μεγάλαν τὸ πρῶτον χρημάτων πραθεῖσα, ἐπειθ' οὕτως ὑπὸ τῆς εὐχερείας ἐπευνήθη, ὥστε καὶ λογοποιηθῆναι ὅτι καὶ ὑάλινα τὶς σκεύη συντετριμμένα ὅψιν τι, πολίτης ἔσται——ἡ δ' οὖν Μεσσαλίνα, οἷ τε ἀπελεύθεροι αὐτοῦ οὕτως οὐ τὴν πολιτείαν μόνον, οὐδὲ τὰς στρατείας, καὶ τὰς ἐπιτροπείας, τὰς τε ἡγεμονείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τ' ἄλλα πάντα ἀφειδῶς ἐπώλουν, καὶ ἐκαπήλευον. Dio, l. 60. p. 676, C. D. E. Hence Tacitus says, *Per avaritiam Claudianorum temporum, empto jure muniendi.* *Hist.* l. 5. c. 12.

<sup>z</sup> It has been a question much agitated among the learned, how St. Paul's ancestor became free of the city of Rome? St. Paul saying in his answer to Lysias, *But I was free born*, Acts xxii. 28. Vid. Gron. not. ad Joseph. p. 41—46. Never certainly was there a dispute more needless, since it is so very plain from many unquestionable authorities that the freedom of the city of Rome was attainable by foreigners various ways. By merit: thus the two whole cohorts of Camertians before named; thus Heracliensium legio, and many others, mentioned by Tully in the same place, pro Balbo, c. 22. By favour: thus the cohort garrisoned at Trapezus, spoken of by Tacitus, *Hist.* l. 3. c. 47. Thus Alaudarum legio, so often mentioned by Cicero. Suet. Jul. 24. 2. Nothing more certain than that the Jews assisted Julius Cæsar with their forces. Jos. Antiq. l. 14. c. 8. §. 1, 2, 3. which he also very grate-

procurator of Judæa to Cæsar<sup>a</sup>. There were many laws made by the Romans, allowing of appeals from inferior magistrates<sup>b</sup>, and particularly from the governors of provinces. The emperor Augustus appointed certain persons of consular dignity to hear such appeals<sup>c</sup>.

It is added, that upon this appeal *Festus consulted with the council*<sup>d</sup>. That the governors of provinces had a certain number of persons with them, which they were obliged to consult and advise with, and particularly in matters of judicature,

fully acknowledges. Ibid. c. 10. §. 2. 7. The like they did by Mark Antony. Ibid. c. 15. §. 8. Can it be supposed that many of them did not at that time, either by merit or favour, procure the freedom of the city of Rome? or was it Antipater alone who had that honour conferred on him? Ibid. c. 8. §. 3. By money, as we have already seen. Hence probably it is we read of so many Jews free of the city of Rome who dwelt in Greece and Asia. Ibid. c. 10. §. 13. 14. 16—19. By being freed from servitude: that very great numbers became citizens this way through the covetousness or vainglory of their masters, as well as from their own merit, vid. Dionys. Halic. Ant. Rom. l. 4. c. 24. Suet. Aug. c. 42. n. 3. That multitudes of the Jews in particular became free this way, appears from that Tiberius enlisted four thousand freed Jews at one time, and sent them to Sardinia. Compare Suet. Tib. c. 36. n. 2. Tac. Ann. l. 2. c. 85. n. 4. Jos. Antiq. l. 18. c. 3. §. 5.

<sup>a</sup> Acts xxv. 11. 25. and xxvi. 32.

<sup>b</sup> Alex. ab Alex. l. 4. c. 6. l. 49. tit. 1—5. Dig. Grot. in loc. Wolf. Cur. in loc.

<sup>c</sup> Appellationes quotannis urbanorum quidem litigatorum prætori delegavit urbano: at provincialium consularibus viris, quos singulos cujusque provinciæ negotiis præposuisset. Aug. c. 33. 4. Vid. Pitisci Not. ibi, n. 14, 15.

<sup>d</sup> Ch. xxv. 12.

is abundantly evident from Tully<sup>e</sup>, Josephus,<sup>f</sup> Dio<sup>g</sup>, and Philo Judæus<sup>h</sup>.

St. Paul was after this sent with other prisoners to Rome<sup>i</sup>. It was a usual thing to send persons from the provinces to be tried at Rome, as we learn from Suetonius<sup>k</sup>, Josephus<sup>l</sup>, Pliny<sup>m</sup>, and other authors.

When they were arrived at Rome, it is said, *the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard*<sup>n</sup>: but Paul was suffered to dwell by

<sup>e</sup> *Honestos homines, qui causam norint, ableget, a concilioque dimittat? In Ver. l. 2. 32. (79.) Illud negabis, te concilio tuo dimisso, viris primariis, qui in concilio C. Sacerdotis fuerant, tibi-que esse solebant, remotis, de re judicata judicâsse? teque eum, quem C. Sacerdos, adhibito concilio, causa cognita, absolvisset; eundem remoto concilio, causa incognita, condemnâsse? Ibid. 33. (81.) Servos, quos ipse cum concilio, belli faciendi causa consensisse judicavit, eos sine concilii sententia, suas ponte, omni supplicio liberavit, l. 5. 8. (18.) Crimen sine accusatore, sententia sine concilio, damnatio sine defensione. Ibid. 9. (23.)*

<sup>f</sup> *Antiq. l. 20. c. 4. §. 4. et de Bell. l. 2. c. 16. §. 1.*

<sup>g</sup> *Τοὺς δὲ δὴ παρέδρους αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἑκάστους αἰρεῖται, ἓνα μὲν οἱ ἐστρατηγῆκότες, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων σφίσι, ἣ καὶ τῶν ὑποδεεστέρων τρεῖς δὲ, οἱ ὑπατευκότες, ἐκ τῶν ὁμοτίμων, οὓς ἂν καὶ ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ δοκιμάσῃ. l. 33. p. 505, fin.* Doubtless ἣ stands not here for *or*, but for *eight*. The pro-prætor chose one of prætorian, and eight of inferior dignity. The proconsul, three of consular, and I suppose also eight or more of a lower rank.

<sup>h</sup> *Leg. ad Caium, p. 1027, B. fin. Vid. Grot. in Matt. xxvii. 19.*

<sup>i</sup> *Acts xxvii. 1.*

<sup>k</sup> *Aug. c. 33. 4.*

<sup>l</sup> *Ἱερεῖς τινες, καλοὺς κραγαθοὺς, διὰ μικρὰν καὶ τὴν τυχοῦσαν αἰτίαν δήσας εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἐπεμψεν, λόγον ὑφέξοντας τῷ Καίσαρι. Vit. §. 3. Antiq. l. 20. c. 5. §. 2. de Bell. l. 2. c. 5. §. 3. et 12. §. 6. et c. 13. §. 2.*

<sup>m</sup> *L. 10. ep. 97.*

<sup>n</sup> *Τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ, very properly translated captain of the guard, or præfecto prætorio; for there was but one camp in the city of*

*himself with a soldier that kept him*<sup>o</sup>. That it was usual for prisoners to be put under the care of the *præfectus prætorio*, or captain of the guard, is evident from Tacitus<sup>p</sup>, Josephus<sup>q</sup>, and Pliny<sup>r</sup>. And though they were ordinarily confined in the prætorian camp, yet that such as were esteemed less guilty were sometimes favoured so far as to be permitted to dwell in their own houses with a soldier chained to them, appears from Josephus<sup>s</sup>. And this I take to be that which in the Roman law is called *Aperta, et libera, et in usum hominum instituta custodia militaris*<sup>t</sup>.

It is said, Acts xxii. 30. of Lysias the commanding officer at Jerusalem, who in the absence of the procurator supplied his room, and acted as such, ἐκέλευσεν ἔλθεῖν τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν. In like manner Josephus, de Bell. l. 2. c. 15. §. 6. says of Gessius Florus the procurator, μεταπεμψάμενος τοὺς τε ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τὴν βουλὴν.

Rome, and that was of the prætorian soldiers. Vid. Tac. Ann. l. 4. 2. Suet. Tib. 37. 2. Vid. Not. Pitisci ad Aug. 49. 4. n. 12.

<sup>o</sup> Acts xxviii. 16.

<sup>p</sup> Cit. Grot. in loc.

<sup>q</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 6. (Hud. 7.) §. 6. compared with Suet. Cai. c. 12. 3. Dio, l. 58. p. 626, C. Agrippa was ordered into the custody of *Macro præfectus prætorio* by Tiberius, and we read that many were under the same confinement, Jos. ibid. §. 7. and that the place of their imprisonment was the camp. For when Agrippa was ordered to a more easy confinement at his own house, it is said, ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου μεταστήσειν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. Ibid. §. 10.

<sup>r</sup> L. 10. ep. 65.

<sup>s</sup> Ubi supra.

<sup>t</sup> L. 2. C. de Exact. Trib.

## CHAP. X.

*An account of the places referred to.*

I PROCEED now to the fourth thing, which is to treat of the places mentioned. The History of the Acts takes in a large extent of ground, speaking not only of several countries in general, but of many cities and places in particular, the situations and distances of which are also sometimes accidentally hinted. And I will venture to affirm, that the more thoroughly and curiously we examine these, and the more strictly we compare them with the accounts given us by the ancient geographers and historians, the more fully shall we find them confirmed. Strabo, a learned philosopher, who lived in the reigns of the emperors Augustus and Tiberius, and travelled into most parts of the world, that he might with the greater accuracy describe the situation of countries and cities, wrote a geography in seventeen books. These he finished about thirty years before the Acts of the Apostles were wrote, and almost every place mentioned in the History of the Acts is spoken of by him, and described in exact agreement therewith.

§. 1. It is said that Paul and Barnabas departed from Antioch unto Seleucia, and sailed thence to Cyprus <sup>a</sup>. Strabo tells us, that Seleucia was a city in Syria, situate upon the seacoast, about fifteen miles from Antioch, and five from the mouth of the river Orontes <sup>b</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. xiii. 4.

<sup>b</sup> L. 16. p. 751. A. D.

It is also said that they preached at Salamis, and went through the island unto Paphos<sup>c</sup>. Salamis is accordingly placed by Strabo at the east end of Cyprus<sup>d</sup>, and Paphos at the west end<sup>e</sup>.

It is added, they loosed from Paphos, and came to Perga in Pamphylia<sup>f</sup>: and, agreeably hereto, Strabo informs us that Paphos had a port<sup>g</sup>; that Perga was a city in Pamphylia, situate upon the river Cestrus; and that it is sixty furlongs sailing up the river to the city<sup>h</sup>.

It is further said, that they departed from Perga to Antioch in Pisidia<sup>i</sup>, and went afterwards to Iconium<sup>k</sup>, and thence to Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia<sup>l</sup>. Pisidia is described by Strabo as bordering upon Pamphylia<sup>m</sup>, and Lycaonia as adjoining to Pisidia<sup>n</sup>. He mentions Antioch as a city in Pisidia<sup>o</sup>, Iconium as a city in Lycaonia<sup>p</sup>, and Derbe as a city in the borders of Isauria<sup>q</sup>, which Isauria he also expressly says is in Lycaonia<sup>r</sup>. He makes no mention indeed of Lystra; but Pliny, who wrote a very few years after him, does<sup>s</sup>. And Hierocles the

<sup>c</sup> Ch. xiii. 5, 6.      <sup>d</sup> L. 14. p. 682, B. C. D.      <sup>e</sup> P. 681, fin.  
683, C. D.      <sup>f</sup> Ch. xiii. 13.      <sup>g</sup> P. 683, C.      <sup>h</sup> L. 14.

p. 667, C.      <sup>i</sup> Ver. 14.      <sup>k</sup> Ver. 51.      <sup>l</sup> Ch. xiv. 20, 21.

<sup>m</sup> L. 12. p. 569, fin. 570, pr.      <sup>n</sup> P. 568. and 569.

<sup>o</sup> P. 569, B. and 577, A.      <sup>p</sup> P. 568, C.      <sup>q</sup> P. 569, A.

<sup>r</sup> P. 568, D.

<sup>s</sup> L. 5. §. 42. Lystreni. It is true he places them in Galatia; but Cellarius has clearly proved that he brings down Galatia too far southward. Vid. Not. Orb. Antiq. vol. 2. l. 3. c. 4. p. 111. 115. 122. Pliny says, Attingit Galatia—Lycaoniæ partem obigenem. And though, §. 42, he places the Thebaseni in Galatia, yet, §. 25, he says, Ipsius Lycaoniæ celebrantur Thebasa in Tauro. Hyde, In confinio Galatiæ. He seems to me to have no clear notion of the bounds of these two countries, and so it appeared



grammarian, in his *Synecdemus*, places it in Lycaonia; and in the *Notitia Episcopatum* it is taken notice of as a bishop's see <sup>t</sup>.

In their return, it is said, they passed through Pisidia to Pamphylia, and, having preached at Perga, went down to Attalia, and thence sailed to Antioch in Syria, from whence they set out <sup>u</sup>. Attalia is accordingly described by Strabo as a city of Pamphylia, situate upon the seacoast <sup>x</sup>; and Antioch, the metropolis of Syria, as seated upon the river Orontes, to which a person might sail up the river from the seacoast in a day's time <sup>y</sup>.

§. 2. St. Paul set out a second time from Antioch, in company with Silas, and went through Syria and Cilicia to Derbe in Lycaonia <sup>z</sup>. Strabo tells us, that Syria was bounded in the north by Cilicia Campestris <sup>a</sup>; (for Cilicia was divided into two parts, the one called Aspera, the other Campestris;) and that Cilicia Aspera, the part which was most remote from Syria, bordered upon Lycaonia <sup>b</sup>.

It is added in the History of the Acts, *Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia, and the regions of Galatia, and were forbidden to preach in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they essayed to go into Bithynia* <sup>c</sup>. In agreement herewith, Strabo describes Lycaonia, Phrygia, Galatia, Mysia,

to Father Harduin, as you may see by his notes on the places I have quoted.

<sup>t</sup> Vid. Cellar. Not. vol. 2. l. 3. c. 4. p. 122.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. xiv. 24, 25.

<sup>x</sup> L. 14. p. 666, D. et 667.

<sup>y</sup> L. 16. p. 750, B. 751, A.

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xv. 41. and xvi. 1.

<sup>a</sup> L. 16. p. 749, A. B. et l. 14. p. 676, C. D.

<sup>b</sup> L. 14. p. 668, A. B. l. 12. p. 568, C. D. et p. 537, C.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. xvi. 6, 7.

and Bithynia, as countries bordering one upon another<sup>d</sup>. He also makes mention of Asia properly so called<sup>e</sup>: and Catullus the poet expressly distinguishes it from Phrygia<sup>f</sup>. And a Scholiast upon Apollonius Rhodius says that Lydia was formerly called Asia<sup>g</sup>.

It is further added, *And they, passing by Mysia, came down to Troas, and loosing from Troas, came with a strait course to Samothracia, and the next day to Neapolis; and thence to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony*<sup>h</sup>. That Phrygia, Mysia, and the country of Troas, bordered upon each other, is easily learnt from Strabo<sup>i</sup>; as also that the city of Troas, at one time called Antigonía, afterwards Alexandria and Alexandria Troas, was situate upon the seacoast<sup>k</sup>. That Samothracia was an island over against the confines of Thrace bordering upon Macedonia<sup>l</sup>. That Neapolis bounded the Strymonic bay on the north

<sup>d</sup> L. 12. p. 566, C.

<sup>e</sup> L. 12. p. 577, C. l. 13. p. 627, D. compared with p. 625, D. 620, D.

<sup>f</sup> Epig. 46. Linquantur Phrygii, &c. Ad claras Asiæ volumus urbes.

<sup>g</sup> Vid. Spanheim. de Usu et Præst. Numism. t. 1. p. 621. 622. This Strabo also says, ubi supra.

<sup>h</sup> Ch. xvi. 8. 11. 12.

<sup>i</sup> Compare together, l. 12. p. 574, B. et 576, C. et l. 13. p. 581. 583. 613, D. Æolis proxima est, quondam Mysia appellata, et quæ Hellesponto adjacet, Troas. *Plin.* l. 5. §. 32.

<sup>k</sup> L. 13. p. 581, C. 593, D. et 604, B. Troadis primus locus Hamantius, dein Cebrenia, ipsaque Troas, Antigonía dicta, nunc Alexandria, *Plin.* l. 5. §. 33. It is called Troas without any addition, l. 7. ff. de Cens. et l. 8. §. 9. ff. eod. et in nummo Caracallæ, Col. Aug. Troas. Vid. Not. Hard. in *Plin.* loc. prox. cit.

<sup>l</sup> L. 2. p. 124, B. l. 1. p. 28, B. l. 7. p. 331, B.

side<sup>m</sup>; placed also by Pliny, Dio, and Ptolemy on the seacoast<sup>n</sup>; and in the *Itinerarium* of Antoninus said to be twelve miles distant from Philippi<sup>o</sup>. And that Philippi, (called by the epitomiser Datum) was a city in Macedonia, and had docks for the building of ships<sup>p</sup>. And Appian expressly informs us, that they navigated ships up to the city.

<sup>m</sup> L. 7. p. 330, fin.

<sup>n</sup> A meridie Ægeum mare, cujus in ora a Strymone Apollonia, Ocsyma, Neapolis. *Plin.* l. 4. §. 18. p. 439. *Dio.* l. 47. p. 348, A. 351, C.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. *Cellar. Not.* vol. 1. l. 2. c. 13. p. 676.

<sup>p</sup> The words of the epitomiser are these: Εἰσὶν δὲ περὶ τὸν Στρυμονικὸν κόλπον πόλεις καὶ ἑτεραι· οἷον Μύρκινος, Ἀργίλος, Δραβίσκος, Δάτον, ἔπερ καὶ ἀρίστην ἔχει χώραν, καὶ εὐκαρπον, καὶ ναυπηγία, καὶ χρυσοῦ μέταλλα· ἀπ' οὗ καὶ παροιμία Δάτον ἀγαθὸν, ὡς καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀγαθίδες· ὅτι πλεῖστα μέταλλά ἐστι χρυσοῦ ἐν ταῖς κρηνίσιν, ὅπου νῦν οἱ Φίλιπποι πόλιν ἱδρύται; and a little after, "Ὅτι ἡ νῦν Φίλιπποι πόλιν Κρηνίδες ἐκαλοῦντο τὸ παλαιόν. L. 7. p. 331. The reason why I say that Philippi is the Datum here described are the words of Appian, who assures us it was first called Crenides, and then Datus: Οἱ δὲ Φίλιπποι πόλιν ἐστίν, ἣ Δάτος ὀνομάζετο πάλαι, καὶ Κρηνίδες ἔτι πρὸ Δάτου· κρῆναι γὰρ εἰσὶ περὶ τῆς λόφου ναμάτων πολλάι. *De Bell. Civ.* l. 4. p. 650, A. The description also exactly agrees. Appian tells us, on the north side was a very large wood, which, it is probable, supplied them with timber for the building of ships: Ἐκ δὲ τῆς δύσεως, πεδίον μέχρι Μουρκίνου τε, καὶ Δραβίσκου, καὶ ποταμοῦ Στρυμόνος, τριακοσίων πού καὶ πενήκοντα σταδίων, εὐφορον πάντῃ καλόν. And a little before, Πρὸς δὲ τῇ μεσημβρίᾳ ἔλος ἐστὶ, καὶ θάλασσα μετ' αὐτό; and towards the bottom of the page, Ἐλὴ καὶ λίμναι μέχρι τοῦ Στρυμόνος. The lake, which came up to the city, was a proper place for their docks. Whether they had a passage from the sea into this lake, or from the river Strymon, or sailed up the river Ganga or Gangites, mentioned also by Appian, is not so clear; but that they navigated up to the city of Philippi is certain; for Appian tells us that Tullius Cimber put into Philippi with a navy carrying a legion and other soldiers: Οἱ δὲ ἀμφὶ τὸν Βροῦτον ἐκ παραλόγου τόλμης ἐς Φιλίππους παρήλθον, ἔνθα αὐτοῖς καὶ ὁ Τύλλιος ἐπικατήχθη, καὶ πᾶς ὁ στρατός

It is our misfortune, that in the description of Macedonia we have not Strabo's own work, but only an imperfect abstract. I am persuaded, the other particulars here mentioned were not omitted by Strabo, however they came to be left out by his abbreviator. That Philippi was a colony we are assured by Pliny<sup>q</sup>. And the same thing is fully evident from coins, and other monuments of antiquity<sup>r</sup>. Livy informs us that L. Æmilius Paulus, having overcome and taken Perseus the king, divided Macedonia into four parts, naming them the first, second, third, and fourth<sup>s</sup>. Philippi was situate in that which was called the first part: and several learned men<sup>t</sup> understand St. Luke to mean no more here, than that Philippi was a city of the first part of Macedonia, which, by a very small alteration of one of his words, as they at present stand, he is made to say<sup>u</sup>. The reason is, because Livy tells us, that Æmilius Paulus appointed Amphipolis to be the capital city of the first part of Macedonia. But I cannot think that there is any need of making even so small an alteration in the words of St. Luke. For what is there more liable to change than the state of cities? Amphipolis, it is true, was the chief city of the first part of Macedonia when

συνεληλύθει. Vid. p. 648. et 650, A. It is true, other authors place Datus differently, and Dio makes even Crenides a place distinct from Philippi, l. 47. p. 348, A. It is not an easy task always to reconcile historians and geographers.

<sup>q</sup> Intus Philippi colonia, l. 4. §. 18. p. 439.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Cell. Not. vol. 1. l. 2. c. 13. p. 676.      <sup>s</sup> L. 45. c. 29.

<sup>t</sup> Vid. Pierce, in his Preface to the Notes on the Epistle to the Philippians.

<sup>u</sup> Πρώτης instead of πρώτη, or of πρώτη τῆς.

conquered by Æmilius; but can it be hence concluded that it was so two hundred years after? It was so remarkably sunk and decayed some ages after this, that in an ancient *Notitia Ecclesiastica* it is thrust down to the twenty-second place even of Macedonia Prima<sup>x</sup>. It is evident, from coins now extant, that a Roman colony was planted at Philippi first by Julius Cæsar, and afterwards renewed by Augustus<sup>y</sup>. And the great Spanheim observes, that it was a part of the Roman policy that their colonies should be the metropolises or chief cities of the countries in which they were placed. It is highly probable therefore, that either Philippi was become a larger and more populous city than Amphipolis before the colony was fixed there, or that by planting the colony there it became such, and was thenceforth esteemed the chief city of that part of Macedonia. This is certain, that Strabo, who wrote in the times of Augustus and Tiberius, if we may depend upon the faithfulness of his abbreviator, takes not the least notice of Amphipolis, though he mentions Philippi more than once. Had Amphipolis been the capital city of this part of Macedonia in his time, could he have been guilty of such a neglect? He mentions other cities in this part: would he omit the capital? It is possible therefore, that even in Strabo's time Amphipolis was sunk beneath his notice<sup>z</sup>.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Spanheim. de Usu et Præst. Num. Diss. 9. p. 652, pr.

<sup>y</sup> Id. Diss. 2. p. 105, 106.

<sup>z</sup> It may be objected, that upon the coins of the city of Philippi there is no evidence of its being the metropolis, as there is upon the coins of other colonies which were so. Nor is there any evidence of this kind upon the coins of Amphipolis, *Θεός*

From Philippi St. Paul and his companions passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, and went thence to Berœa<sup>a</sup>. Apollonia<sup>b</sup>, Thessalonica<sup>c</sup>, and Berœa<sup>d</sup>, are all mentioned by Strabo as cities in Macedonia. Amphipolis, as I observed before, is not taken notice of by him, at least not by his epitomiser. This city however is spoken of by Herodotus<sup>e</sup>, Thucydides<sup>f</sup>, and Scylax<sup>g</sup> the geographer, who all lived before Strabo; by Livy<sup>h</sup>, his contemporary, and Pliny<sup>i</sup>, who flourished soon after him. It is also mentioned in the *Itinerarium Antonini*; and, comparing that *Itinerarium* with what Strabo has said of the Via Egnatia<sup>k</sup>, (a Roman causey or highway made from the seacoast opposite to Italy quite through Macedonia to the river Hebrus, and afterwards to Constantinople,) it seems highly probable that that way lay through five of the cities we have been speaking of, i. e. from Pella to Thessalonica, thence to Apollonia, thence to Amphipolis, thence to Philippi, and thence to Neapolis.

From Berœa St. Paul was conducted to Athens, and went thence to Corinth<sup>l</sup>. These are cities of so great fame in antiquity, that it is almost needless to observe that Strabo makes mention of both<sup>m</sup>, and

Καῖσαρ Σεβαστὸς, and on the reverse, Ἀμφιπολίτ. Vid. Spanh. de Usu et Præst. Num. Quarto, p. 416. et Hard. Not. in Plin. l. 4. §. 17. p. 436. n. 14.

<sup>a</sup> Acts xvii. 1. 10.

<sup>b</sup> L. 7. p. 331, B. col. 1.

<sup>c</sup> P. 330, A. col. 2.

<sup>d</sup> P. 330, B. col. 2.

<sup>e</sup> L. 7. c. 114.

<sup>f</sup> L. 1. p. 66. et l. 4. p. 320.

<sup>g</sup> Περίπλους.

<sup>h</sup> L. 44. c. 45. et l. 45. c. 29.

<sup>i</sup> L. 4. §. 17. p. 436, fin. Vid. Cell. Not. vol. 1. p. 675.

<sup>k</sup> L. 7. p. 322, D. 323, A. B. C. D. et 329, D. col. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Acts xvii. 15. and xviii. 1.

<sup>m</sup> L. 9. p. 395, &c. l. 8. p. 378, pr.



tells us, that although Corinth was destroyed by the Romans under Lucius Mummius, it was restored by Julius Cæsar <sup>n</sup>. It is said that St. Paul sailed from Corinth into Syria, having shorn his head at Cenchrea; that he put in by the way at Ephesus, and sailed thence to Cæsarea <sup>o</sup>. Strabo informs us that Corinth had two ports, one towards Italy, and the other towards Asia; that Cenchrea was the port which was towards Asia <sup>p</sup>; that Ephesus had a port, and was seated in the peninsular Asia <sup>q</sup>; and that Stratonis Turris, which was the ancient name of Cæsarea, was in Syria, and had a station for ships <sup>r</sup>.

§. 3. St. Paul set out a third time from Antioch, and, having travelled over all the countries of Galatia and Phrygia, came to Ephesus, and continued disputing there in the school of Tyrannus by the space of two years, *so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus* <sup>s</sup>. It appears evident from Strabo, that a certain district round Ephesus went by the name of Asia properly so called <sup>t</sup>.

St. Paul went from Ephesus to Macedonia, thence to Greece, and through fear of the Jews returned again to Macedonia, set sail from Philippi, and came to Troas in five days. His companions took ship here, and sailed to Assos; but he went thither on foot. From Assos, having taken him on board, they sailed to Mitylene <sup>u</sup>. That a ship might easily sail from Philippi to Troas in five days, may be collected

<sup>n</sup> P. 379, pr. et 381.

<sup>o</sup> Ch. xviii. 18. 19. 22.

<sup>p</sup> L. 8. p. 378, pr. et 380, pr.

<sup>q</sup> L. 14. p. 641, C. fin.

<sup>r</sup> L. 16. p. 758, D. Vid. Joseph. Antiq. l. 15. c. 9. §. 6.

<sup>s</sup> Ch. xviii. 22.

<sup>t</sup> L. 12. p. 577, C.

<sup>u</sup> Acts xx. 1. 2. 3. 6. 13. 14.

without difficulty from what Strabo has laid down<sup>x</sup>. He also informs us that Assos was a seaport, and places it not far from Troas<sup>y</sup>; and that Mitylene was a large city in the isle of Lesbos, having two ports, the one north, the other south; that from the seacoast, which lies between Assos and Polymedium, upon the continent, to Methymna in Lesbos, was but sixty furlongs<sup>z</sup>.

Paul and his companions sailed from Mitylene, and the next day came over against Chios, and the next day arrived at Samos, and tarried at Trogyllium, and the next day came to Miletus<sup>a</sup>. From the island of Chios to the isle of Lesbos, Strabo tells us, is four hundred furlongs<sup>b</sup>, which make not quite forty-six of our statute miles. Samos, he informs us, is an island opposite to Panionium and Ephesus<sup>c</sup>. He does not give us the distance between that and Chios; but, if we may make a conjecture from the measurement he gives us upon the continent from Ephesus to Teos<sup>d</sup>, the distance is not quite so great as it is from Chios to Lesbos. The same author says that Trogyllium is the name both of a promontory upon the continent, and of an island that lies before the promontory, and that from Samos to Trogyllium are but forty furlongs<sup>e</sup>, i. e. something more than four miles and a half of our measure. It is probable the apostle and his companions put in at Samos, but chose to lodge at Trogyllium.

<sup>x</sup> L. 2. p. 124, C. et l. 10. p. 457, D. Hom. ibi cit.

<sup>y</sup> L. 13. p. 581, C. D. p. 610, B. C.

<sup>z</sup> L. 13. p. 616, fin. 617, A. B. <sup>a</sup> Ch. xx. 15.

<sup>b</sup> L. 14. p. 645, D. <sup>c</sup> L. 14. p. 639, B. C.

<sup>d</sup> L. 14. p. 643, C. D. <sup>e</sup> L. 14. p. 636, C. D.

It is added, *And the next day came to Miletus*; whence St. Paul sent for the elders of the church of Ephesus, who came to him there<sup>f</sup>. Strabo places Miletus not far from Trögyllium, and says it had four havens<sup>g</sup>. He gives us the distance from Miletus to the mouth of the river Mæander<sup>h</sup>, but not from the Mæander to Ephesus. From Magnesia, which stood near the Mæander, to Ephesus, he makes a hundred and twenty furlongs<sup>i</sup>. And I am apt to think the common road from Miletus to Ephesus lay through Magnesia; for from Pyrrha to the mouth of the Mæander he says was fens and bogs<sup>k</sup>. And the public road from Phycus to Ephesus he describes as going through Tralles and Magnesia<sup>l</sup>. The distance therefore from Ephesus to Miletus, upon the common road, I should conjecture to be about thirty Roman, or near twenty-eight of our statute miles.

The sacred historian proceeds and says, *After we had launched*, that is, from Miletus, *we came with a strait course unto Coos, and the day following unto Rhodes, and from thence unto Patara*<sup>m</sup>. Coos, Strabo tells us, is an island over against Termerium, a promontory of the Myndians, and not far from Cnidus, Ceramus, and Halicarnassus, cities in Caria<sup>n</sup>. He places Rhodes near the turning of the continent, where the shore runs to the north, whence the strait course to the Propontis is by keeping in

<sup>f</sup> Ch. xx. 15. 17.

<sup>g</sup> L. 14. 634, D. 635, A.

<sup>h</sup> L. 14. p. 636, A. B. From Miletus to Pyrrha thirty furlongs, thence to the mouth of the Mæander fifty.

<sup>i</sup> L. 14. p. 663, B. et 636, C.

<sup>k</sup> P. 636, B.

<sup>l</sup> L. 14. p. 663, A. B.

<sup>m</sup> Ch. xxi. 1.

<sup>n</sup> L. 14. p. 656, A. B. et 657, B.

the same meridian<sup>o</sup>. From the few places he mentions on the continent between Coos and Rhodes, or rather, I should say, between the places on the shore opposite to these two islands, we may reasonably conclude that they were not so far distant, but persons might easily sail from the one to the other in a day's time. Patara he describes to be a considerable city of Lycia on the east side of the river Xanthus, having a port for ships<sup>p</sup>. And whoever will be at the pains of observing Strabo's method in describing these places, will easily see that Coos, Rhodes, and Patara lay in the way from Miletus to Syria<sup>q</sup>.

It is added by the sacred historian, *And finding a ship at Patara sailing unto Phœnicia, we went on board. Now when we had discovered Cyprus, we left it on the left hand, and sailed into Syria, and landed at Tyre<sup>r</sup>*. That the island of Cyprus lay between Patara and Syria, any one who will compare together the descriptions which Strabo has given us of Lycia, Cyprus, and Syria will presently learn<sup>s</sup>. The same learned author makes Phœnicia a part of Syria<sup>t</sup>, and places Tyre in Phœnicia. This having been a maritime town of so great fame in the world, I think I need not add that he says it had two ports<sup>u</sup>.

The sacred historian further says, *And when we had taken our leave of the brethren of Tyre, we took ship, and came to Ptolemais, and the next day to Cæsarea<sup>x</sup>*. Ptolemais, formerly called Ace, is accordingly described by Strabo as a large city on the

<sup>o</sup> P. 655, D.      <sup>p</sup> P. 666, A.      <sup>q</sup> Vid. p. 664, A. B.

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xxi. 2, 3.      <sup>s</sup> L. 14. p. 664, A. p. 681, D. l. 16. p. 749.

<sup>t</sup> L. 16. p. 749, B.

<sup>u</sup> P. 756, C. et 757, A.

<sup>x</sup> Ch. xxi. 6, 7, 8.

seacoast of Phœnicia, south of Tyre <sup>y</sup>, between Tyre and Cæsarea, formerly named Stratonis Turris <sup>z</sup>.

§. 4. In the account of St. Paul's voyage to Rome it is said, *They entered into a ship of Adramyttium, meaning to sail by the coasts of Asia* <sup>a</sup>. Adramyttium is said by Strabo to be a considerable city, having both a port and station for ships <sup>b</sup>, situate in Troas, Æolis, or Mysia. For these three countries, laying in the north-west part of the peninsular Asia, he plainly proves were blended together by ancient writers <sup>c</sup>.

It is added by the sacred historian, *And the next day we touched at Sidon* <sup>d</sup>. Sidon, Strabo informs us, was a city and port of great antiquity, much celebrated by the ancients, and very famous in his own times, situate in Phœnicia, north of Tyre, and that the distance between Sidon and Tyre was not more than two hundred furlongs <sup>e</sup>. He has not indeed told us the distance from Tyre to Cæsarea. The *Peutingerian Table* makes it sixty Roman miles <sup>f</sup>. The *Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum* makes it sixty-three <sup>g</sup>; the *Itinerarium Antonini*, seventy-six <sup>h</sup>. The whole distance from Cæsarea to Sidon, according to Ptolemy, is but one degree <sup>i</sup>. But if we take it according to the largest computation, viz. that of the *Itinerarium Antonini*, the whole distance is little

<sup>y</sup> L. 16. p. 758, A.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. D.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. xxvii. 1.

<sup>b</sup> L. 13. p. 606, fin. et 614, A. B.

<sup>c</sup> L. 13. p. 583, A. p. 586, D. l. 12. p. 564, B. 565, C. 571, C. D. &c. l. 13. p. 613, D.

<sup>d</sup> Ch. xxvii. 3.

<sup>e</sup> L. 16. p. 756, C. p. 757, C. D.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Rel. Pal. l. 2. c. 4. p. 421.

<sup>g</sup> Reland. Palæst. l. 2. c. 4. p. 416, 417.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 418.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. c. 10. p. 457. 460. 465.

more than thirty leagues, or about ninety-one and a half of our statute miles. If Strabo informs us right, the ancients would sail much further than this in the space of twenty-four hours. He tells us, that from Sammonium to Egypt was four days and four nights sailing, computed at five thousand furlongs<sup>k</sup>, i. e. five hundred and seventy-three of our statute miles. To sail this distance in four days and four nights, they must sail each twenty-four hours a hundred and forty-three of our statute miles, which is about six miles an hour. Herodotus confirms the same thing, telling us, a ship would sail in twenty-four hours one thousand three hundred furlongs<sup>l</sup>, i. e. very near a hundred and forty-nine of our statute miles. Aristides says, that with a fair wind a ship would easily make one thousand two hundred furlongs<sup>m</sup>, i. e. a hundred and thirty-seven one-third of our miles; and Polybius denies that they could sail two thousand furlongs in a day<sup>n</sup>.

The historian proceeds, *And when we had launched from thence, we sailed under Cyprus, because the winds were contrary; and when we had sailed over the sea of Cilicia and Pamphylia, we came to Myra, a city of Lycia*<sup>o</sup>. They sailed between Cyprus and Cilicia, and then along the Pamphylian coast to Lycia. And that these countries are thus situated may be easily seen from Strabo's description of them<sup>p</sup>, who will also teach us that

<sup>k</sup> L. 10. p. 475, C.

<sup>l</sup> Melpom.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Casaub. not. in lib. 1. p. 35. Strab. p. 23. col. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Cit. Strab. l. 1. p. 25, D. Vid. Casaub. not. p. 17. col. 1, D. et col. 2, A.

<sup>o</sup> Ch. xxvii. 4, 5.

<sup>p</sup> L. 14. p. 681, D.



Myra was in Lycia, seated upon a high hill about twenty furlongs from the sea <sup>q</sup>.

The sacred historian further says, *And there the centurion found a ship of Alexandria sailing into Italy; and he put us therein. And when we had sailed slowly many days, and scarce were come over against Cnidus* <sup>r</sup>. Alexandria was the metropolis of Egypt, between which and Italy was carried on a very great commerce, so that there were ships frequently passing from the one to the other, which is particularly taken notice of by Strabo <sup>s</sup>. We have already observed from the same learned author, that Cnidus is a city in Caria nearly opposite to the island of Coos. In a former voyage the apostle seems to have sailed from Coos to Patara, a city of Lycia, further east than Myra, in two days. They were now many days at sea, and made less way.

It is added, *the wind not suffering us, we sailed under Crete, over against Salmone* <sup>t</sup>. The wind not permitting them to bear out to sea, they sailed close by the Cretan shore, near to the eastern end of it, called by Strabo *Samonium* <sup>u</sup>, by Pliny *Sammonium* <sup>x</sup>, with two *m*'s; by Dionysius, *Salmonis* <sup>y</sup>, with an *l*, as in the History of the Acts; and it is called *Capo Salomon* at this day <sup>z</sup>.

It is further added, *and, hardly passing by it, came to a place which is called the Fair Havens, nigh whereunto was the city of Lasea* <sup>a</sup>. There is no mention of these places in Strabo. Stephanus

<sup>q</sup> L. 14. p. 666, A.      <sup>r</sup> Ch. xxvii. 6, 7.      <sup>s</sup> L. 17. p. 793, A.

<sup>t</sup> Ch. xxvii. 7.      <sup>u</sup> L. 10. p. 474, D.      <sup>x</sup> L. 4. §. 20.

<sup>y</sup> Ver. 110.      <sup>z</sup> Vid. Hard. not. in Plin. l. 4. §. 20. n. 7. et

Cell. Not. Orb. Ant. vol. 1. l. 2. c. 14. p. 818.      <sup>a</sup> Ch. xxvii. 8.

has a name near akin to the former. He tells us that Καλή Ἀκτὴ, i. e. the Fair Shore, was a city in Crete<sup>b</sup>; but he does not say in which part of the island it lay, and it is impossible for us to determine whether it were the same place which St. Luke calls the Fair Havens. This is the first place we have met with that we have not abundant authorities for from other authors: and considering how few of the ancient writers are come down to us, it is much more to be admired that we have not found many such, than that we have met with this one. Diodorus Siculus the historian names two cities in Crete that are found in no other historian or geographer<sup>c</sup>. Polybius does the same<sup>d</sup>. And even in that very succinct account of affairs given us by Velleius Paterculus is mentioned a city in Crete taken notice of by no other writer<sup>e</sup>. This is more common among the geographers. Scylax speaks of three<sup>f</sup>, Pliny four<sup>g</sup>, Ptolemy four<sup>h</sup>, and Stephanus twenty-seven cities<sup>i</sup>, the names of which are in no other authors now extant.

There were not a few who anciently wrote the history and geography of Crete<sup>k</sup>. Had they been preserved we should have had a much more distinct and full account of the several parts of that island

<sup>b</sup> De Urbibus.      <sup>c</sup> Cæno et Tripodus. Vid. Meursii Creta.

<sup>d</sup> Oriti, l. 4. p. 319, C. This indeed Meursius takes to be Olerii, and that very probably, Diatonium. Excerpt. Legat. c. 45.

<sup>e</sup> Mycenæ, cap. 1. p. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Baucas, Ormisda, Pan. Vid. Meursii Creta.

<sup>g</sup> Clatos, Elæa, Lasos, Pylorus. Harduin, it is true, by his emendations, has reduced these to one, which is Lasos, l. 4. §. 20.

<sup>h</sup> Innacherium, Pannona, Pœcilasium, Rhamnus. Vid. Meursii Creta.

<sup>i</sup> Apea, Alba, Alloria, Anopolis, Aulon, Axus, Bien-nus, &c. Vid. Meur. Creta.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Meur. Cret. cap. 1.

than we now have. Doubtless there were many places in it which are not taken notice of by any of the geographers or historians that are come down to us. It is well known that Crete was very early inhabited; and having the happiness of good laws and excellent governors, it soon became a most populous, potent, and flourishing island, and most of the Grecian states received their polity and laws from thence<sup>1</sup>. It is called by Homer *ἐκατόμπολις*<sup>m</sup>, as having a hundred cities in his time: and those hundred cities, we are told, were particularly named by Xenion, in his History of Crete<sup>n</sup>. Many of these cities were in ruins long before the Acts of the Apostles was wrote. Strabo is so very brief in his account of the island, that I think he mentions but fourteen or fifteen of the cities which were standing, and five only of those which were destroyed. I am apt to think that not a few of those which are named by the other geographers were of the number of the destroyed. Of this sort most evidently was the city Lasea, spoken of by St. Luke: for after he had mentioned the Fair Havens, he adds, *nigh whereunto was the city of Lasea*, *ἤν πόλις Λασαία*, the very phrase made use of by Strabo with regard to Phæstus, one of the ancient cities of Crete, which was destroyed, dug up, and turned into fields by the Gortynians<sup>o</sup>. It is not very improbable that the Lasos mentioned by Pliny might be the Lasea of

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Shuckford's Connect. vol. 3.      <sup>m</sup> Iliad. l. 2. v. 156.

<sup>n</sup> Tzetzes in Lycoph. cit. Meur. cap. 1. p. 2.

<sup>o</sup> L. 10. p. 479, C. Φαιστός δὲ ἦν αὐτῇ. Vid. et l. 13. p. 612. 'Αμφότεροι δ' ἦσαν, spoken of Lyrnessus and Thebes, A. fin. 'Η χρίσα ἦν. C. fin. 'Ενταῦθα δὲ ἦν καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Σμινθέως 'Απόλλωνος καὶ ἡ Χρυσῆς, C. fin.

St. Luke. It might be called by both names, as in the same island the city Pergamum<sup>p</sup> was also called Pergamea<sup>q</sup>. And though it be reckoned by Pliny as an inland city, yet possibly it might be nearer to the Fair Havens than any other city was, and therefore described by St. Luke as nigh thereunto.

The Fair Havens not being a place fit to winter in, the sacred historian informs us that the greater part of the passengers advised to depart thence, that they might attain to Phœnice, a haven of Crete, lying towards the south-west and north-west<sup>r</sup>. This, as I take it, and Meursius is of the same opinion, is mentioned by Strabo under the name of Phœnix Lampei<sup>s</sup>. It is certainly named both by Ptolemy and Stephanus, and was a bishop's see at the time of the council of Nice<sup>t</sup>.

It is afterwards said, that a tempest arising, they ran under a certain island which is called Clauda<sup>u</sup>. This is not taken notice of by Strabo; for he omits almost all the islands that lay nearest to Crete<sup>x</sup>. Ptolemy speaks of it, and describes it as lying at the west end of Crete. It is also mentioned in the *Notitia Ecclesiæ* as having a bishop<sup>y</sup>.

After this St. Luke says, *they were driven up and down in Adria*<sup>z</sup>. And Strabo more than once

<sup>p</sup> Vell. Paterc. pr. Plin. l. 4. §. 20.

<sup>q</sup> Virg. *Æn.* l. 3. v. 132. Plut. Lycurgo. Scylax. Vid. Cell. N. O. Ant. vol. 1. l. 2. c. 14. p. 820. What renders it the more likely is, that Pliny does not confine himself to cities then in being. He mentions Phæstus, destroyed long before his time.

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xxvii. 12.

<sup>s</sup> L. 10. p. 475, A.

<sup>t</sup> Vid. Cell. N. O. Antiq. vol. 1. l. 2. c. 14. p. 817. et Meurs. Cret. p. 54 et 55.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. xxvii. 16.

<sup>x</sup> Compare Strabo,

l. 10. p. 484, C. with Pliny, Ptolemy, and Mela.

<sup>y</sup> Vid. Cell. N. O. A. l. 2. c. 14. p. 826.

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xxvii. 27.

tells us that the Ionian sea was in his days called *Adria*<sup>a</sup>. The same we learn from Ovid<sup>b</sup>, Philostratus<sup>c</sup>, and Pausanias<sup>d</sup>. It is evident also from St. Jerom and Orosius that this name reached quite to the Afric shore : for Hilarion, sailing from Parætonium in Egypt to Sicily, is said to pass through the midst of *Adria*<sup>e</sup> : and the Tripolitan province is said by Orosius to be bounded on the north by the Adriatic sea<sup>f</sup>. The same author tells us that the island of Crete is bounded on the south by the Libyan or African sea, which they also call the Adriatic<sup>g</sup>. And Procopius says that the islands Gaulus and Melita divide the Adriatic and Tuscan sea<sup>h</sup>.

The sacred historian informs us that they were at length shipwrecked, but that all the passengers escaped safe to land upon an island called *Melita*<sup>i</sup>. This is said by Strabo to lie opposite to Pachynum, a promontory of Sicily, which is described by him as pointing eastwards towards the Peloponnesus and the passage to Crete<sup>k</sup>.

From *Melita*, it is said, they sailed in a ship of Alexandria to Syracuse<sup>l</sup>. Syracuse, Strabo tells us,

<sup>a</sup> L. 2. p. 123, D. l. 7. p. 317, pr.

<sup>b</sup> Fastor. l. 4. v. 501. Trist. l. 1. Eleg. 10. v. 4.

<sup>c</sup> L. 2. Imag. in Polemone, prop. fin. et de Vit. Apoll. l. 4. c. 8. p. 181, C.

<sup>d</sup> Eliac. p. 174. l. 13. Arcad. p. 281. l. 33.

<sup>e</sup> In Vit. Hilarionis.

<sup>f</sup> Tripolitana provincia—habet a septentrione mare Siculum, vel potius Adriaticum. L. 1. c. 2. p. 19.

<sup>g</sup> Insula Creta finitur—a meridie Lybico, quod et Adriaticum vocant. Ibid. p. 20.

<sup>h</sup> In Vandal. l. 1. cap. 14, fin. p. 212.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. xxviii. 1.

<sup>k</sup> L. 6. p. 277, C. et p. 265, D. et l. 17. p. 834, B. C.

<sup>l</sup> Ch. xxviii. 12.

is a city on that side of Sicily which makes the straits, i. e. the straits between Italy and Sicily<sup>m</sup>. From Syracuse they sailed to Rhegium<sup>n</sup>. This city Strabo places among the Bruttii<sup>o</sup>, and describes as situate upon the coast of the straits between Italy and Sicily, and names the straits themselves from this city<sup>p</sup>; and says, that from hence it is fifty furlongs sailing to the promontory of Leucopetra<sup>q</sup>, which is the end or toe of Italy<sup>r</sup>.

It is added by the sacred writer, *and after one day the south wind blew, and we came the next day to Puteoli*<sup>s</sup>. This, Strabo tells us, was a city in Campania, a place of great trade, and an excellent port<sup>t</sup>, and more particularly, that it was the port used by the Alexandrian ships<sup>u</sup>. And whoever will consider the situation of the several parts of Italy, as described by him, will easily perceive that a south wind was the fairest to fill the sails, and convey a ship from Rhegium to Puteoli<sup>x</sup>. In the Greek of St. Luke is δευτεραῖοι ἤλθομεν. They waited one day at Rhegium for a fair wind, and the next day the wind turning south, they set sail; and two days after they had set sail (for that the word δευ-

<sup>m</sup> L. 6. p. 267, B. C.<sup>n</sup> Ch. xxviii. 13.<sup>o</sup> L. 6. p. 257, A. fin. B.<sup>p</sup> Ibid. p. 265, D.<sup>q</sup> P. 259, A.<sup>r</sup> L. 5. p. 211, D.<sup>s</sup> Ver. 13.<sup>t</sup> L. 5. p. 245, C. D.

<sup>u</sup> L. 17. p. 793, A. Omnis in pilis Puteolorum turba consistit, et ex ipso genere velorum Alexandrinas, quamvis in magna turba navium, intelligit, &c. *Sen. ep. 77, pr.* Titus went this way from Alexandria to Rome. *Suet. Tit. c. 5, n. 4, 5.* Festinans in Italiam, cum Rhegium, dehinc Puteolos oneraria nave appulisset, Romam inde contendit.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. l. 6. p. 266, C. D. p. 259, A. l. 5. p. 210, et seq.



τεραῖοι properly <sup>y</sup> signifies) they arrived at Puteoli, which they might easily do.

It is added, that as they went towards Rome, *the brethren came to meet them as far as Appii Forum, and the Three Taverns* <sup>z</sup>. These places are not taken notice of by Strabo, but they are both mentioned by Tully <sup>a</sup>, and the former by Horace <sup>b</sup>, and were on the famous Via Appia that led from Rome to Brundisium. And by the computation of the *Itinerarium Antonini* the latter was twenty-three, the former forty-one Roman miles from the city of Rome.

We have now examined the journeys and voyages of St. Paul and his companions; and of the numerous places named therein we find but seven which are omitted by Strabo, the chief of the ancient geographers that are come down to us. The rest are described by him in exact agreement with the History of the Acts. Of the seven omitted by him, five are fully and clearly spoken of by other ancient authors. There remain only two therefore of which a doubt can be admitted whether they are mentioned by any of the ancient writers now extant. And of these two one was a city that had been destroyed <sup>c</sup>,

<sup>y</sup> Vid. Raphelii Annot. ex Herod. p. 406. et ex Xenoph. p. 137.

<sup>z</sup> Ver. 15.

<sup>a</sup> Ad Attic. l. 2. ep. 10. He dates the letter from Appii Forum, and says, he had sent another but a little before from the Three Taverns.

<sup>b</sup> Sat. l. 1. 5. v. 3.

<sup>c</sup> The seven are Lystra, Amphipolis, the Fair Havens, Lasea, Clauda, Appii Forum, and the Three Taverns. The two are, the Fair Havens and Lasea. Of which the former, it is probable, is the Καλὴ Ἀκτὴ of Stephanus, the latter the Lasos of Pliny.

and for that reason probably neglected by the historians and geographers that have reached our age.

§. 5. Most of the other places mentioned in the History of the Acts are also to be found in Strabo. Philip is directed by an angel to go towards the south unto the way that goeth from Jerusalem to Gaza, which is desert <sup>d</sup>, in order to meet the Ethiopian eunuch, who was returning from Jerusalem to his own country. Agreeably hereto, Strabo describes Gaza as desert, and places it towards Egypt, consequently south of Jerusalem, and in the way to Ethiopia <sup>e</sup>.

St. Paul says to Lysias, *I am a man which am a Jew of Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city* <sup>f</sup>. Strabo tells us that Tarsus in Cilicia was so famous for learning that it exceeded Athens, Alexandria, and every place where philosophy and other learning was taught: that Rome itself was a witness of the multitude of learned men it produced; for it was full of Tarsians and Alexandrians <sup>g</sup>. And Josephus says it was the most celebrated city of all Cilicia, being the metropolis <sup>h</sup>.

Strabo informs us that Damascus <sup>i</sup> was a famous city of Syria, if not the most renowned of all the cities that lay in that part towards the Persian dominions <sup>k</sup>. That Joppa <sup>l</sup> was a seaport, whence Je-

<sup>d</sup> Acts viii. 26, 27, 28.

<sup>e</sup> L. 16. p. 759, C. Vid. et Joseph. de Bell. Jud. l. 4. c. 11. §. ult.

<sup>f</sup> Acts xxi. 39. xxii. 3. and ix. 11.

<sup>g</sup> L. 14. p. 673, C. to p. 675, D.

<sup>h</sup> Ταρσὺς γάρ παρ' αὐτοῖς τῶν πόλεων ἡ ἀξιολογωτάτη μητρόπολις οὔσα.

Ant. l. 1. c. 6. §. 1. p. 17.

<sup>i</sup> Mentioned Acts ix. 2, 3, 10.

<sup>k</sup> L. 16. p. 756, A.

<sup>l</sup> Mentioned Acts ix. 36, 42, 43.

rusalem, the metropolis of the Jews, might be seen : that it lay near to Jamnia, and between Cæsarea<sup>m</sup> and Azotus<sup>n</sup>. Saron<sup>o</sup>, Eusebius, and Jerom tell us, was a plain that reached from Joppa to Cæsarea<sup>p</sup>. This in the LXX. is called Drumus<sup>q</sup>, and both Strabo<sup>r</sup> and Josephus<sup>s</sup> speak of part of it at least under that name. Strabo makes mention also of Samaria and Galilee<sup>t</sup>. In the History of the Acts Samaria is the name both of a city and country<sup>u</sup>, and so it is in Josephus<sup>x</sup> and other writers<sup>y</sup>. Lydda<sup>z</sup>, though omitted by Strabo, is mentioned by Pliny<sup>a</sup>, Josephus<sup>b</sup>, and many other authors<sup>c</sup>. It is said in the History of the Acts to be nigh unto Joppa<sup>d</sup>. We have not the number of miles between these two places transmitted down to us, but enough is said to convince us they could not be far the one from the other. Strabo has told us that Joppa was near to Jamnia, and in the *Itinerarium Antonini* is

<sup>m</sup> Mentioned Acts viii. 40.

<sup>n</sup> L. 16. p. 759, A. B.

<sup>o</sup> Mentioned Acts ix. 35.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Reland. Palæst. l. 1. c. 32. p. 188. et Cell. N. O. Ant. l. 3. c. 13. p. 321.

<sup>q</sup> Is. lxxv. 10.

<sup>r</sup> L. 16. p. 758, fin. et 795, A. prop. fin.

<sup>s</sup> De Bell. l. 1. c. 13. §. 2. et Antiq. l. 14. c. 13. §. 3. Vid. et LXX. in 4to Reg. xix. 23. Is. xxxvii. 24.

<sup>t</sup> L. 16. p. 760, D.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. viii. 1, 5.

<sup>x</sup> De Bell. l. 3. c. 3. §. 4, &c. 7. §. 32. Antiq. l. 14. c. 4. §. 4, prop. fin. et c. 5. §. 3. et l. 15. c. 8. §. 5.

<sup>y</sup> Hieron. de Locis Hebr. cit. Cellar. N. O. Ant. l. 3. c. 13. p. 313.

<sup>z</sup> Mentioned Acts ix. 32, 35.

<sup>a</sup> L. 5. §. 15.

<sup>b</sup> Antiq. l. 13. c. 4. §. 9. p. 569, pr. l. 14. c. 11. §. 2. et de Bell. l. 2. c. 19. §. 1. et l. 3. c. 3. §. 5. et l. 4. c. 8. §. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Cell. N. O. A. l. 3. c. 13. p. 322. et Reland. l. 3. p. 877, 878.

<sup>d</sup> Ch. ix. 38.

put down twelve Roman miles between Lydda and Jamnia<sup>e</sup>.

It is said of the apostle Peter and his friends, that they set out one day from Joppa and entered Cæsarea the next<sup>f</sup>. We have no account in the *Itinerarium* of the distance from Joppa to Cæsarea; but from Lydda, which was near to it, we have three accounts. The *Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum* makes it thirty-six Roman miles<sup>g</sup>. The *Itinerarium Antonini* in one place makes forty<sup>h</sup>, in another fifty-nine<sup>i</sup>. The numbers in this last place are probably corrupted. An Arab writer, quoted by the learned Reland, says that the distance between Joppa and Cæsarea was thirty miles; and Ptolemy makes the difference of latitude to be twenty-five minutes<sup>k</sup>.

Cæsarea is in the History of the Acts distinguished from Judæa. It is said of Herod Agrippa, *that he went down from Judæa to Cæsarea*<sup>l</sup>. In like manner the prophet Agabus is said *to have come down from Judæa to Cæsarea*<sup>m</sup>. Agreeably hereto Strabo places Cæsarea in Phœnicia<sup>n</sup>, and so does Josephus<sup>o</sup>. The latter gives a reason why it could not be in that which was properly Judæa; because the Jews would not have suffered Herod to have built temples and erected images in their country, these things being forbidden them; he therefore chose foreign countries and cities to adorn and beau-

<sup>e</sup> P. 32. called there Lamnia, as also in the Peutingerian Tables. Vid. Reland. Pal. l. 2. p. 419.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. x. 23, 24.

<sup>g</sup> P. 154.

<sup>h</sup> P. 32.

<sup>i</sup> P. 43.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Reland Pal. l. 3. p. 675. et l. 2. p. 460.

<sup>l</sup> Ch. xii. 19.

<sup>m</sup> Ch. xxi. 8. 10.

<sup>n</sup> L. 16. p. 758, D.

<sup>o</sup> Antiq. l. 15. c. 9. §. 6. *Κεῖται μὲν γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἐν τῇ Φοινίκῃ.*

tify in this manner<sup>p</sup>. For Herod had built a temple to Augustus in Cæsarea, and had placed a coloss or large image of his therein<sup>q</sup>. Accordingly the Syrians which inhabited Cæsarea, in the quarrel they had with the Jews about preference, tell them, that when the city went by the name of Stratonis Turris, i. e. before Herod built and adorned it, there was not a Jew dwelt in it<sup>r</sup>. Notwithstanding this, Josephus himself, in another part of his works, calls it a city of Judæa<sup>s</sup>. When he calls it so, he means by Judæa the ancient seat of the twelve tribes, which is a sense that both he<sup>t</sup> and other writers<sup>u</sup> sometimes put upon the word; but not Judæa strictly and properly taken, as distinguished from Samaria and Galilee.

Lysias the chiliarch, or tribune, ordered that two hundred soldiers, threescore horsemen, and two hundred spearmen, should be ready at the third hour of the night, i. e. about nine o'clock at night, to bring St. Paul safe to Cæsarea<sup>x</sup>. St. Luke afterwards says, that *the soldiers, as it was commanded them, took Paul, and brought him by night to Antipatris*<sup>y</sup>. Some learned men understand this as

<sup>p</sup> Πόλεις τε κτίζων, καὶ ναοὺς ἐγείρων, οὐκ ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ἠνέσχοντο, τῶν τοιούτων ἀπηγορευμένων ἡμῖν, ὥς ἀγάλματα καὶ τύπους μεμορφωμένους τιμᾶν πρὸς τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν τρόπον, τὴν δ' ἔξω χώραν, καὶ τὰς πόλεις οὕτως κατεσκευάζετο. Ibid. §. 5.

<sup>q</sup> De Bell. l. 1. c. 21. §. 7.

<sup>r</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. (7. Huds. but the) 8. in truth, §. 7, pr.

<sup>s</sup> De Bell. l. 3. c. 8. §. 1, pr.

<sup>t</sup> Antiq. l. 1. c. 6. §. 2. Χαναάνος——τὴν νῦν Ἰουδαίαν καλουμένην εἰκήσας, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Χαναanaίαν προσηγόρευσε.

<sup>u</sup> Hieron. Euseb. &c. cit. Reland. Palæst. l. 1. p. 35, 36.

<sup>x</sup> Acts xxiii. 23.

<sup>y</sup> Ver. 31.

done the same night<sup>z</sup>, but there is not the least necessity of so understanding it. The order given by Lysias was, that they should travel in the night-time, that St. Paul's going to Cæsarea might be concealed from the Jews, and there might be no insurrection or attempt made to murder him. This order the soldiers obeyed, and brought him to Antipatris by night, but it is not said they did this in one night. They might probably reach Nicopolis the first night, and, resting there all day, go to Antipatris the next night. So, when it is said in the verse immediately following, *on the morrow they left the horsemen to go with him, and returned to the castle*, it is not necessary to understand this as though the two hundred soldiers and two hundred spearmen went back to Jerusalem in one day: no; on the morrow after they arrived at Antipatris, knowing that their prisoner was now safe from any attempt of the Jews<sup>a</sup>, and needed not so great a guard, they returned towards the castle of Antonia, from whence they set out.

Antipatris, Josephus informs us, was a city built by Herod the Great, in honour of his father<sup>b</sup>. In the Mishna it is said to lie in the way from Jeru-

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Cell. N. O. Ant. l. 3. c. 13. p. 324.

<sup>a</sup> Cestius Gallus in his retreat, or rather flight from the siege of Jerusalem, was pursued by the Jews to Antipatris. The reason is, because from Jerusalem to Antipatris was a mountainous, hilly country, and they had great advantages over him; but from Antipatris to Cæsarea was a plain. They came off the mountainous into a hilly country indeed at Nicopolis; but the mountains lay close by them from Nicopolis to Lydda, and from Lydda to Antipatris. Vid. Jos. de Bell. l. 2. c. 19. §. 7, 8, 9. et l. 1. c. 4. §. 7. et c. 21. §. 9.

<sup>b</sup> Antiq. l. 16. c. 5. §. 2.



saalem to Galilee<sup>c</sup>. That it was in the road from Jerusalem to Cæsarea fully appears from the *Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum*, and is sufficiently evident from Josephus<sup>d</sup>. We are told by the same author, that from Jerusalem to Cæsarea was six hundred furlongs<sup>e</sup>, about sixty-eight and a half of our statute miles; but he has nowhere given us the distance from Jerusalem to Antipatris. The *Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum* makes it forty-two Roman miles, i. e. something more than thirty-eight of our statute miles, twenty-two Roman miles from Jerusalem to Nicopolis or Emmaus, ten miles thence to Lydda, and ten more from Lydda to Antipatris<sup>f</sup>.

The learned Cellarius, to whom the world is greatly indebted for the indefatigable pains he has taken in collecting and clearing up the ancient geography, supposes an error in the first of these numbers, and that instead of twenty-two it ought to be but eight<sup>g</sup>, taking for granted that Nicopolis is the same with the Emmaus<sup>h</sup> mentioned in St. Luke's Gospel<sup>i</sup>, and by Josephus<sup>k</sup> as sixty furlongs from Jerusalem. So that, according to him, from Jeru-

<sup>c</sup> Gittin. 7. m. 7. cit. Reland. Pal. l. 3. p. 569.

<sup>d</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 19. §. 1. et l. 4. c. 8. §. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Antiq. l. 13. c. 11. §. 2. et de Bell. l. 1. c. 3. §. 5.

<sup>f</sup> A day's journey to some who ran was one hundred and fifty Roman miles, according to Pliny. To walkers, a day's journey, according to Herodotus, is two hundred and fifty furlongs, something more than thirty-one miles. From Athens to Megara, according to Aulus Gellius, twenty miles; according to Procopius, more than twenty-six miles. A day's journey in the Gemara is forty Roman miles; in the Misna, from Jerusalem to Acrabba, Lydda, or Jordan. Vid. Reland. Palæst. l. 2. c. 1. p. 400, 401.

<sup>g</sup> N. O. Ant. l. 3. c. 13. p. 323.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 340, 341.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. xxiv. 13.

<sup>k</sup> De Bell. l. 7. c. 6. §. 6.

saalem to Antipatris was but twenty-eight Roman, or about twenty-five and a half of our statute miles. Agreeably hereto, Joannes Damascenus says it is eighteen miles from Jerusalem to Lydda<sup>1</sup>. Cellarius judges this account to be confirmed by the History of the Acts, understanding that the soldiers which conducted St. Paul performed their journey to Antipatris the same night they set out<sup>m</sup>. But Reland, who has with great industry and learning given us the geography of Palestine in particular, has, I think, quite removed the foundation on which Cellarius builds, and fully proved that the Emmaus which was afterwards called Nicopolis was not the same with that mentioned by St. Luke and Josephus as sixty furlongs distant from Jerusalem, but another Emmaus in the tribe of Dan, beyond Beth-horon, between that and Lydda, and in the direct road from Antipatris to Jerusalem<sup>n</sup>.

It is said in the History of the Acts, that the mount called Olivet was from Jerusalem a sabbath-day's journey<sup>o</sup>. A sabbath day's journey is explained in the Syriac translation to be about seven furlongs. Epiphanius says it was but six furlongs<sup>p</sup>. Mount Olivet is by Josephus placed five furlongs from Jerusalem<sup>q</sup>. In another part of his works he tells us that Titus ordered part of his army to encamp, when they were six furlongs distant from Jerusalem, on

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Cell. p. 322.

<sup>m</sup> P. 324. paulo post med.

<sup>n</sup> L. 2. c. 6. p. 426, &c. Vid. Jos. de Bell. l. 2. c. 19. §. 1. 8. et l. 4. c. 8. §. 1. Cellarius himself proves that Beth-horon was one hundred furlongs, or twelve miles, distant from Jerusalem. Ibid. p. 325.

<sup>o</sup> Ch. i. 12.

<sup>p</sup> Hær. 66. cit. Reland. Pal. l. 2. p. 398.

<sup>q</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. (7. Huds. but should be) 8. §. 6.

mount Olivet<sup>r</sup>. No doubt the mount of Olives was five, six, seven, or more furlongs distant from Jerusalem, according to the part of the city reckoned from, or the part of the mount to which the reckoning was made.

Many learned men think, though this is not said in the History, nor is there any necessity of so understanding it, that the reckoning here began from that part of the mount from which our Lord ascended to heaven. St. Luke tells us in his Gospel, that that was from Bethany<sup>s</sup>. But the town of Bethany, St. John informs us, was fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem<sup>t</sup>. They suppose therefore, that a certain part of the mount, extending some furlongs upwards from the town or village, was called by the name of Bethany<sup>u</sup>, which is a very easy and natural supposition, all villages at this day communicating their name to the whole tract of ground that belongs to them.

But were it certain that the place from which our Lord ascended was close adjoining to the town or village of Bethany, and that the sacred historian understood by a sabbath day's journey, the distance of that village, the Talmudists have given such an account of things as would clear this matter up. They say that a sabbath day's journey is two thousand cubits<sup>x</sup>. This is explained by the Jews to be a Roman mile<sup>y</sup>. They held it lawful for a person

<sup>r</sup> De Bell. l. 5. c. 2. §. 3.      <sup>s</sup> Ch. xxiv. 50, 51.      <sup>t</sup> Ch. xi. 18.

<sup>u</sup> Light. v. 1. p. 252. v. 2. p. 304. et 485. Vid. et Wolf. Cur. in Matt. xxi. 1.

<sup>x</sup> Seld. de Jure Nat. et Gent. l. 3. c. 9. p. 314, &c. Light. vol. 1. p. 252. et vol. 2. p. 485, fin. Buxt. Lex. Talm. p. 2582.

<sup>y</sup> Rel. Pal. l. 2. c. 1. p. 396, 397.

to walk as far as he pleased in any city. The reckoning of two thousand cubits did not commence till he was out of the city. And if the learned Buxtorf has represented their sense rightly, they included the suburbs also under the name of the city<sup>z</sup>, and the suburbs were always two thousand cubits more. These, put together, make a sabbath-day's journey about two Roman miles from the walls of the city, which is about the distance that Bethany was from Jerusalem.

It is very certain the Talmudists have laid down such rules for the measurement of their sabbath-day's journey from any city or town, that they frequently included large spaces beyond the utmost houses of the town, sometimes two thousand cubits<sup>a</sup>, and thereby took in neighbouring towns or villages. With regard to Jerusalem in particular, Bethphage, which we learn from the sacred writers was situate upon Olivet, and from others that it was a mile distant from Bethany, is by the Talmudists reckoned as a part of Jerusalem<sup>b</sup>. Hence, therefore, a sabbath-day's journey reaches Bethany. St. Luke, speaking in the Acts of the Apostles after the Jewish manner, *a sabbath-day's journey*, must be supposed to reckon as they did, i. e. from Bethphage. St. John, speaking after the Roman manner, reckons from the walls of Jerusalem.

<sup>z</sup> Lex. Tal. p. 2583.

<sup>a</sup> Light. vol. 2. p. 304. Seld. de Jur. Nat. l. 3. c. 9. p. 317, 318, 319.

<sup>b</sup> Buxt. Lex. Tal. p. 1691. Light. vol. 1. p. 252. vol. 2. p. 37, 39, 40.

## CHAP. XI.

*The principal facts confirmed.*

HAVING considered the several incidental and circumstantial things mentioned in the History of the Acts, and seen how far they are confirmed by other authors, I now proceed to the principal matters therein related, which are the propagation of the Christian religion, and the miraculous means made use of to accomplish it. The writer of this History gives a plain narration of the fulfilment which Christ made of his promise to endue his followers with power from on high, and of their spreading the gospel doctrine by their preaching, and the wonders they wrought through some of the most known parts of the Roman empire, together with the opposition that was made to it; but this so very briefly, that it is evident he omits many more things than he records. In endeavouring to shew how far what he says is confirmed by other authors, I shall begin with those who lived at the time when the things themselves were transacted. Through the good providence of God there are some pieces come down to us which were written by the persons principally concerned in the facts recorded. I mean the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. John, together with the Epistles of the holy apostles, most of which were sent before the History of the Acts was finished, and contain an ample confirmation of well-nigh all the things therein related.

§. 1. In this History is frequent mention made of the baptism of John, the forerunner of our Lord <sup>a</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. i. 22. xiii. 24. xviii. 25. and xix. 3, 4.

*John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus*<sup>b</sup>. Accordingly we read in the Gospel of St. Mark, that John *did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance*<sup>c</sup>. And in all three of the Gospels we are told that he referred to Christ, who should come after him. And St. John expressly says, that the intention hereof was, that the people might believe on him: *He came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe*<sup>d</sup>. Another saying of John the Baptist is recorded in the Acts, *Whom think ye that I am? I am not he. But, behold, there cometh one after me, whose shoes of his feet I am not worthy to loose*<sup>e</sup>. And agreeably hereto, in the Gospel of St. John, the Baptist is introduced, saying, *Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him*<sup>f</sup>. And the other part of the saying, *Behold, there cometh one after me, whose shoes' latchet I am not worthy to loose*, is mentioned by all the three evangelists<sup>g</sup>.

It is represented in the Acts, that when our Lord, immediately before his ascension, ordered his disciples not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, he added, *For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence*<sup>h</sup>. And in the Gospel of St. Mark, John the Baptist says, *There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet*

<sup>b</sup> Ch. xix. 4.<sup>c</sup> Ch. i. 4.<sup>d</sup> Ch. i. 7.<sup>e</sup> Ch. xiii. 25.<sup>f</sup> Ch. iii. 28. et i. 20.<sup>g</sup> Matt. iii. 11. Mark i. 7. John i. 27.<sup>h</sup> Ch. i. 5. et xi. 16.



*of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down to unloose. I indeed have baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost<sup>i</sup>. And much to the same purpose in the other two Gospels<sup>k</sup>.*

It is said in the Acts, that *the preaching of Jesus began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached<sup>l</sup>*. And thus it is represented in the three Gospels: St. Matthew says, *Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee. From that time Jesus began to preach, and say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand<sup>m</sup>*. And St. Mark: *Now after that John was put into prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God<sup>n</sup>*.

§. 2. It is added in the Acts, that *the word preached by Jesus was published throughout all Judæa<sup>o</sup>*. And we read both in St. Matthew and St. Mark, that Christ not only preached himself in the cities of Judæa, but that he chose twelve, whom he sent on the same errand<sup>p</sup>. St. Peter is represented in the Acts as saying to the Jews that *Jesus of Nazareth was approved of God among them by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of them, appealing to their own knowledge of the fact, as ye yourselves also know<sup>q</sup>*. And in another place, to Cornelius and his friends, *Jesus of Nazareth went about doing good, and*

<sup>i</sup> Ch. i. 7, 8.

<sup>k</sup> Matt. iii. 11. John i. 26, 27, 33.

<sup>l</sup> Ch. x. 36, 37. et xiii. 24.

<sup>m</sup> Ch. iv. 12, 17.

<sup>n</sup> Ch. i. 14. See also John i. 43, &c. et ii. 1—11.

<sup>o</sup> Ch. x. 37.

<sup>p</sup> Matt. x. 5, 6, 7. Mark vi. 7. 12. 30.

<sup>q</sup> Ch. ii. 22.

*healing all that were oppressed of the Devil*<sup>r</sup>. And that our blessed Lord went about from place to place, both in Galilee and Judæa, not only preaching repentance, and the gospel kingdom, but also healing the diseased and the lame, and performing the greatest miracles, is the known subject of the three Gospels.

It is said in the Acts, that *he chose him apostles*; and the names of the eleven, which were then living, are recorded<sup>s</sup>. His choosing twelve apostles is particularly related by St. Mark, and both St. Matthew and St. Mark give us their names<sup>t</sup>, all which, excepting one, are the same with those in the Acts. The twelve are represented in the Acts as having been with Christ from the beginning of his ministry, or from John's baptism, and as his witnesses to the people<sup>u</sup>. Accordingly, in St. John's Gospel, Jesus says to the twelve, *And ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning*<sup>x</sup>. In the Acts Jesus tells them, *Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth*<sup>y</sup>. And in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, he commissions them to go teach all nations<sup>z</sup>: *Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel unto every creature*<sup>a</sup>.

§. 3. The circumstances of our Lord's trial and death, referred to in the Acts, agree exactly with

<sup>r</sup> Ch. x. 38.

<sup>s</sup> Ch. i. 2. 13.

<sup>t</sup> Matt. x. 1—4. Mark iii. 14, &c. et vi. 30. See also John vi. 67, 70, 71.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. i. 8, 21, 22. ii. 32. iii. 15. iv. 13, 33. v. 32. and xiii. 31.

<sup>x</sup> Ch. xv. 27.

<sup>y</sup> Ch. i. 8.

<sup>z</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

<sup>a</sup> Mark xvi. 15,

the relation in the three Gospels. St. Paul is introduced as saying, *Those that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, though they found no cause of death in him, yet desired they Pilate that he should be slain*<sup>b</sup>. And both St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us, that though the chief priests and Jewish council sought for witness against Jesus, yet they found none<sup>c</sup>: that, notwithstanding, they were urgent with Pilate to crucify him<sup>d</sup>: and this, though he declared that he found no fault in him<sup>e</sup>. The apostle Peter is represented in the Acts as speaking to the Jews in this manner concerning our Saviour; *Whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you*<sup>f</sup>. Both St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us, when the chief priests and elders of the people had bound Jesus, they led him away, and delivered him to Pontius Pilate the Roman governor<sup>g</sup>. And St. John, *When Pilate said unto them, Shall I crucify your King? the chief priests answered, We have no king but Cæsar*<sup>h</sup>. And all three relate, that when Pilate would have released unto them Jesus, the Jews asked Barabbas<sup>i</sup>, who, St. Mark says, had been guilty of sedition, and had committed murder<sup>k</sup>. St. John further adds, that *Pilate sought to release Jesus, but the Jews cried*

<sup>b</sup> Ch. xiii. 28.<sup>c</sup> Matt. xxvi. 59, 60. Mark xiv. 55.<sup>d</sup> Matt. xxvii. 22, 23. Mark xv. 13, 14.<sup>e</sup> Matt. xxvii. 24. John xviii. 38. and xix. 4.<sup>f</sup> Ch. iii. 13, 14.<sup>g</sup> Matt. xxvii. 1, 2. Mark xv. 1.<sup>h</sup> Ch. xix. 15.<sup>i</sup> Matt. xxvii. 17, 18, 20. Mark xv. 9, 10, 11. John xviii. 39, 40.<sup>k</sup> Ch. xv. 7.

out, *If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend*<sup>1</sup>. St. Peter, in the History of the Acts, says to the Jews concerning our Lord, *Whom ye have crucified*<sup>m</sup>; *whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree*<sup>n</sup>. And in another place more fully, *Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain*<sup>o</sup>. And all the three Gospels relate, that it was wholly at the instigation of the Jews that Pilate crucified Jesus.

§. 4. The same apostle, addressing himself to the disciples, asserts, that *Judas, who was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry, was guide unto them that took Jesus*<sup>p</sup>. In all the three Gospels it is said, that Judas betrayed Jesus<sup>q</sup>; and that the manner in which he betrayed him was by being guide to the officers who were sent to apprehend him<sup>r</sup>. And both St. Matthew and St. Mark expressly affirm, that this Judas was one of the twelve apostles, whom he had chosen<sup>s</sup>. St. Peter further adds, *Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out. And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem; insomuch as that field is called in their proper tongue, Aceldama, that is to say, the Field of Blood*<sup>t</sup>. St. Mark tells us, that the chief priests promised to give money to Judas for the betraying of Jesus<sup>u</sup>. St. Matthew is more par-

<sup>1</sup> Ch. xix. 12.    <sup>m</sup> Ch. ii. 36. and iv. 10.    <sup>n</sup> Ch. v. 30. and x. 39.

<sup>o</sup> Ch. ii. 23.    <sup>p</sup> Ch. i. 16, 17.

<sup>q</sup> John xiii. 2, 10, 11, 21, 26.

<sup>r</sup> Matt. xxvi. 47, 48, 49. Mark xiv. 43, 44, 45. John xviii. 2, 3.

<sup>s</sup> Matt. x. 4. Mark iii. 19.

<sup>t</sup> Acts i. 18, 19.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. xiv. 10, 11.

ticular, and says they contracted with him for thirty pieces of silver<sup>x</sup>. He informs us afterwards, that this sum was actually paid him<sup>y</sup>; that a field was purchased with it<sup>z</sup>; and that it was called *the Field of Blood*<sup>a</sup>; and that Judas made a bad end<sup>b</sup>.

§. 5. St. Paul is introduced in the Acts as saying, *And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree, and laid him in a sepulchre*<sup>c</sup>. The taking down the body of Jesus from the cross, and laying it in a sepulchre, is related by all three evangelists<sup>d</sup>. And that he was buried is particularly mentioned by St. Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians<sup>e</sup>. The resurrection of Christ from the dead is frequently insisted on in the Acts of the Apostles<sup>f</sup>. And it is said, that he was seen by, and conversed with, his disciples many days after he arose<sup>g</sup>, *to whom he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs*<sup>h</sup>. The resurrection of Christ is particularly related in each of the three Gospels, as also that he was seen by and conversed with his disciples for a considerable time<sup>i</sup>. The same thing is also confirmed in the Epistles: St. Paul says to the Corinthians, that *Christ rose again the third day, and was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; after that, he was seen of James; then of*

<sup>x</sup> Matt. xxvi. 15.

<sup>y</sup> Ch. xxvii. 3, 5.

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xxvii. 7.

<sup>a</sup> Ver. 8.

<sup>b</sup> Ch. xxvii. 5.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. xiii. 29.

<sup>d</sup> Matt. xxvii. 59, 60. Mark xv. 46. John xix. 40, 41, 42.

<sup>e</sup> Ch. xv. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. i. 22. ii. 24, &c. iii. 15. iv. 10, 33. v. 30. and xvii. 31.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. xiii. 31. and i. 3.

<sup>h</sup> Ch. i. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Matt. xxviii. Mark xvi. John xx. and xxi.

*all the apostles*<sup>k</sup>. And St. John informs us, that when the other disciples had seen Jesus, Thomas not being with them, he declared, that *except he should see in his hands the print of the nails, and put his finger into the print of the nails, and thrust his hand into his side, he would not believe*: and that our Lord coming again to his disciples, when Thomas was with them, did accordingly satisfy him: *Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side*<sup>l</sup>. To which also the same apostle probably refers in the beginning of his First Epistle, when he says, *And our hands have handled of the Word of life*. St. Peter is represented as saying to Cornelius and his friends, *Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead*<sup>m</sup>. St. Mark says, that after his resurrection *he appeared to the eleven as they sat at meat*<sup>n</sup>. And St. John naming eight of his disciples, among whom was Peter, who went a fishing, Jesus shewed himself to them; and having prepared broiled fish and bread, invited them to come and dine with him<sup>o</sup>.

§. 6. There is a particular relation in the Acts of his being received up into heaven in the view of his apostles<sup>p</sup>. St. Stephen also is represented as seeing him in heaven standing on the right hand of God<sup>q</sup>. And we read in the Gospel of St. John, that he not

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 4—7. See Rom. i. 4. iv. 25. vi. 5. and viii. 11.  
<sup>l</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 14. 2 Cor. iv. 14. Phil. iii. 10. 1 Pet. i. 3. and iii. 21.

<sup>l</sup> John xx. 24. 25. 27. <sup>m</sup> Acts x. 40, 41. <sup>n</sup> Ch. xvi. 14.

<sup>o</sup> Ch. xxi. 1. 2. 9. 13. <sup>p</sup> Ch. i. 9, 10. <sup>q</sup> Acts vii. 55, 56.



only foretold the manner of his death and his resurrection, but his ascension into heaven<sup>r</sup>. *Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father. And St. Mark tells us, He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God<sup>s</sup>. The same thing is frequently asserted in the Epistles. St. Peter says, He is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject to him<sup>t</sup>. And St. Paul says, He is passed into the heavens<sup>u</sup>; is made higher than the heavens<sup>x</sup>; is ascended up far above all heavens<sup>y</sup>; where he sitteth at the right hand of God<sup>z</sup>; far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come<sup>a</sup>.*

§. 7. We read in the History of the Acts of the wonderful effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples after our Lord's ascension to heaven<sup>b</sup>; that the apostles were enabled to confer the miraculous gifts of the Spirit on others by laying their hands on them<sup>c</sup>; and that the apostle Paul in particular bestowed these extraordinary endowments<sup>d</sup>. In exact agreement herewith, the apostle Paul says in his Epistle to the Ephesians, *that when Christ ascended on high, he gave gifts unto men<sup>e</sup>*; describes what those gifts were, and how they were divided and distributed, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians<sup>f</sup>;

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xx. 17. and xvi. 16. 28. See vi. 62. and iii. 13.

<sup>s</sup> Ch. xvi. 19.

<sup>t</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 22.

<sup>u</sup> Heb. iv. 14.

<sup>x</sup> Heb. vii. 26.

<sup>y</sup> Eph. iv. 10.

<sup>z</sup> Col. iii. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Eph. i. 20, 21. See Rom. viii. 24. Heb. i. 3. viii. 1. x. 12. and xii. 2.

<sup>b</sup> Ch. ii.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. viii. 17, 18.

<sup>d</sup> Ch. xix. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Eph. iv. 8.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. xii. xiii. and xiv. See also ch. i. 5, 6, 7.

makes mention of them in his other Epistles <sup>g</sup>, and professes his desire of imparting them to the Romans <sup>h</sup>. We read also in this History, that many among the Christian converts were prophets, and enabled to foretell things to come <sup>i</sup>. Agreeably hereto, we find in St. Paul's Epistles, that prophesying was one of the extraordinary gifts bestowed by Christ on his followers <sup>k</sup>.

We read in the Acts, that the apostle Peter gave strength and soundness to the lame <sup>l</sup>, healed the paralytic <sup>m</sup>, raised the dead <sup>n</sup>; and that *by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people; insomuch that they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them. There came also a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folks, and them which were vexed with unclean spirits, and they were healed every one* <sup>o</sup>. It is also said of Stephen the protomartyr, that, *full of faith and power, he did great miracles among the people* <sup>p</sup>: and of Philip, one of the seven deacons chosen with Stephen, that *the people of Samaria gave heed unto the things which he spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. For unclean spirits, crying with a loud voice, came out of*

<sup>g</sup> Rom. viii. 23. and xii. 6, 7, 8. 2 Cor. i. 22. and v. 5. Gal. iii. 2. 5. Eph. i. 13. and iv. 30. Heb. vi. 4.

<sup>h</sup> Rom. i. 11. See Whitby on the place.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. xi. 27, 28. xiii. 1. and xxi. 9, 10, 11.

<sup>k</sup> Eph. iv. 11. 1 Cor. xii. 28. and xiv. 29, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Ch. iii. 2. viii. 8.

<sup>m</sup> Ch. ix. 33, 34.

<sup>n</sup> Ver. 40.

<sup>o</sup> Acts v. 12, 15, 16.

<sup>p</sup> Acts vi. 8.

*many that were possessed: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed*<sup>q</sup>. In agreement herewith it is written in the Epistle to the Hebrews, *How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will*<sup>r</sup>? And in the conclusion of the Gospel according to St. Mark, *So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, i. e. the eleven apostles, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following*<sup>s</sup>.

§. 8. Many and great miracles are related in the History of the Acts to be wrought by St. Paul and his fellow-labourers in their preaching the gospel to the Gentiles<sup>t</sup>. And agreeably hereto, St. Paul says in his Epistle to the Corinthians, *Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought amongst you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds*<sup>u</sup>. And in that to the Romans, *I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ has not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ*<sup>x</sup>.

<sup>q</sup> Ch. viii. 6. 7. 13.<sup>r</sup> Ch. ii. 3, 4.<sup>s</sup> Ch. xvi. 19, 20.<sup>t</sup> Ch. xiii. 11. xiv. 3. 8. xv. 12. xvi. 18. xix. 11, 12. xx. 10, 11. and xxviii. 5. 8. 9.<sup>u</sup> 2 Cor. xii. 12.<sup>x</sup> Ch. xv. 18, 19.

I make not the least doubt but the apostles wrought miracles in every city where they came with a view to preach the gospel, and make converts. St. Luke is so very succinct in his History of the Acts, that he often omits them. He gives us an account only of a miracle or two wrought at Philippi in his whole relation of St. Paul's second journey from Antioch to the west, when he converted a great part of Macedonia and Achaia; though it is evident, from St. Paul's own Epistle already quoted, that he at that time did many signs and wonders at Corinth. And that he did the same at Thessalonica is not obscurely intimated in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians<sup>y</sup>. We read nothing in the Acts of the Apostles of what St. Paul did in Galatia the first time, more than that he went through it<sup>z</sup>. And all that is added the second time he was there is, that *he went over all the country of Galatia, strengthening all the disciples*<sup>a</sup>. Which indeed is an intimation, that the first time he was there he preached the gospel among them, and made converts. But from his Epistle to the Galatian churches it is fully evident that he wrought miracles among them, and conferred on them the gifts of the Holy Spirit. For he asks them, *He that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith*<sup>b</sup>?

§. 9. We are told in the Acts, that great opposition was made by the unbelieving Jews to the

<sup>y</sup> Ch. i. 5.

<sup>z</sup> Acts xvi. 6.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. xviii. 23.

<sup>b</sup> Gal. iii. 3. 5. That he means himself, is evident from the whole tenor of the Epistle. See ch. i. 6. and iv. 11. 13. 14. 19.

spreading of the gospel, and that a severe persecution was raised against the disciples of Christ in Judæa, such which occasioned their dispersion<sup>c</sup>. Of this persecution particular notice is taken by St. Paul in his Epistles. He says to the Thessalonians, *For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judæa are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews*<sup>d</sup>. And he exhorts the Hebrews in his Epistle to them, *Call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated, ye endured a great fight of afflictions; partly, whilst ye were made a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, whilst ye became companions of them that were so used*<sup>e</sup>. St. Paul himself is represented in the History of the Acts as having been forward, zealous, and active in this persecution<sup>f</sup>. He frequently affirms the same thing in his Epistles, saying to the Galatians, *Ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it*<sup>g</sup>; and telling the Corinthians, that *he was the least of the apostles, and not meet to be called an apostle, because he had persecuted the church of God*<sup>h</sup>.

§. 10. He is introduced into the History as saying, that *he was brought up at Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and in the*

<sup>c</sup> Acts viii. 1. and xi. 19.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Thess. ii. 14.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. x. 32, 33.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. vii. 58. viii. 1. ix. 1, 2. xxii. 4, 5. and xxvi. 9, 10, 11.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. i. 13.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 9. See Gal. i. 23. Phil. iii. 6. 1 Tim. i. 13.



*most straitest sect of their religion lived a Pharisee*<sup>i</sup>. Agreeably hereto, in his Epistles he declares, that he *profited in the Jews' religion above many his equals in his own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the tradition of his fathers, and as touching the law was a Pharisee*<sup>k</sup>. In the History is an account of Christ's appearing to him in his way to Damascus<sup>l</sup>. The same is plainly alluded to in his Epistle to the Galatians<sup>m</sup>, in which also he mentions two of his journeys to Jerusalem<sup>n</sup>; and both of them are related in the History of the Acts: that, three years after his conversion, when he escaped from the Jews of Damascus<sup>o</sup>; and the other, fourteen years after his conversion, when he went up with Barnabas from Antioch to consult the apostles and elders whether the believing Gentiles were to be circumcised<sup>p</sup>.

St. Luke has omitted the relation of his journey into Arabia, and his reprehension of the apostle Peter at Antioch, both mentioned by himself in his Epistle to the Galatians<sup>q</sup>; as also the severe sufferings he enumerates in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, *Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep*<sup>r</sup>. These things it is likely might happen the first nine or ten years after St. Paul's conversion, during which time he preached the gospel in Arabia<sup>s</sup>, Syria, and Cilicia<sup>t</sup>. For of

<sup>i</sup> Acts xxii. 3. xxiii. 6. and xxvi. 5.      <sup>k</sup> Gal. i. 14. Phil. iii. 5.

<sup>l</sup> Acts ix. 3, &c. xxii. 6. and xxvi. 12.      <sup>m</sup> Ch. i. 15, 16, 17.

<sup>n</sup> Gal. i. 18. and ii. 1.      <sup>o</sup> Acts ix. 26.      <sup>p</sup> Ch. xv. 2.

<sup>q</sup> Ch. i. 17. and ii. 11, &c.      <sup>r</sup> Ch. xi. 24, 25.      <sup>s</sup> Gal. i. 17.

<sup>t</sup> Gal. i. 21.



this part of his life the book of the Acts gives us a very brief history, probably because St. Luke was not then with him. We are told indeed in the Acts, as well as in his Epistle to the Galatians, of his spending part of this time at Tarsus in Cilicia <sup>u</sup>, and of his preaching a whole year at Antioch in Syria <sup>x</sup>.

We learn from the History, that *the Jews at Damascus took counsel to kill him, and watched the gates day and night to that end*; but their lying in wait being known, *the disciples took him by night, and let him down by the wall in a basket* <sup>y</sup>. The same providential escape is related by himself in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians <sup>z</sup>. He is represented in the Acts as telling the people, that *while he prayed in the temple at Jerusalem, he was in a trance, and saw the Lord* <sup>a</sup>. The same heavenly vision is referred to by him in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians <sup>b</sup>. There is frequent mention made in the Acts of his mission to the Gentiles in particular. Thus, while he was in the trance we have just now spoken of, the Lord says to him, *Depart, for I will send thee far hence to the Gentiles* <sup>c</sup>. He dwells upon the same very often in his Epistles, calling himself *the apostle of the Gentiles* <sup>d</sup>, magnifying his office as such, *the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles* <sup>e</sup>, the teacher of the Gentiles <sup>f</sup>.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. ix. 30. and xi. 25, 26.

<sup>x</sup> Ch. xi. 26.

<sup>y</sup> Acts ix. 23, 24, 25.

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xi. 32, 33.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. xxii. 17, 18.

<sup>b</sup> Ch. xii.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. xxii. 21. See Acts ix. 15. xiii. 2. and xxvi. 17, 18.

<sup>d</sup> Rom. xi. 13.

<sup>e</sup> Rom. xv. 16.

<sup>f</sup> 2 Tim. i. 11. See Gal. i. 15, 16. and ii. 8. Eph. iii. 1—8.

<sup>1</sup> Tim. ii. 7. Phil. ii. 17.

That St. Paul preached the gospel both at Philippi and Thessalonica, cities of Macedonia, we are particularly informed in the History of the Acts<sup>g</sup>. And that he did so, is fully evident from the Epistles yet extant, which he wrote to the churches in those two cities<sup>h</sup>. We are told in the Acts, that St. Paul and his fellow-labourer Silas were stripped, scourged, imprisoned, and their feet made fast in the stocks at Philippi<sup>i</sup>. He gives a plain, though brief hint of these his sufferings in his Epistle to the Philippians<sup>k</sup>. He speaks of them more largely in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians: *Even after that we had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, as ye know, at Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God*<sup>l</sup>. Hence it is also evident that he preached first at Philippi, and afterwards at Thessalonica, according as is related in the History of the Acts<sup>m</sup>. Which is likewise confirmed by the latter part of his Epistle to the Philippians: *Now, ye Philippians, know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me concerning giving and receiving, but ye only. For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessities*<sup>n</sup>.

It is said in the same History, that the unbelieving Jews at Thessalonica, *moved with envy, took*

<sup>g</sup> Ch. xvi. 12, &c. xvii. 1, &c.

<sup>h</sup> Phil. i. 30. 1 Thess. i. 5, 6, 7. ii. 1, 2, 3, &c. and iv. 1, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Thess. iii. 7, &c. See Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, who mentions Paul's having preached there, and his writing an Epistle to them.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. xvi. 22, 23, 24.

<sup>k</sup> Ch. i. 30.

<sup>l</sup> Ch. ii. 2.

<sup>m</sup> Ch. xvi. and xvii.

<sup>n</sup> Ch. iv. 15, 16.

unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them (i. e. Paul and Silas) out to the people. And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, *These that have turned the world upside down, are come hither also; whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus. And they troubled the people, and the rulers of the city, when they heard those things. And when they had taken security of Jason, and of the others, they let them go*<sup>o</sup>. St. Paul, in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, wrote not long after he had left them, upon the account of these troubles, referring to them, says, that *they received the word in much affliction*<sup>p</sup>; and tells them, that he had sent Timothy to them to establish them, that no man should be moved by these afflictions; adding, *For verily, when we were with you, we told you before that we should suffer tribulation; even as it came to pass, and ye know*<sup>q</sup>. The magistrates, having taken bail of Jason and other brethren, it is probable, soon after brought them to a trial for the crimes laid to their charge, and set a severe fine upon them. Thus much seems intimated by the apostle when he says in this Epistle, *For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God, which in Judæa are in Christ Jesus; for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews*<sup>r</sup>. And one part of

<sup>o</sup> Acts xvii. 5—9.    <sup>p</sup> Ch. i. 6.    <sup>q</sup> Ch. iii. 1—4.    <sup>r</sup> Ch. ii. 4.

their sufferings, he tells us, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, was *the spoiling of their goods*<sup>s</sup>. And in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians he highly commends the Thessalonians for their patient bearing these afflictions, as matter of great praise and glory: *So that we ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure*<sup>t</sup>.

We are told in the Acts, that the unbelieving Jews of Thessalonica followed St. Paul to Berœa, stirred up the people against him, and drove him from thence also<sup>u</sup>. And indeed it appears from that History, that it was the constant practice of the unbelieving Jews in every place to oppose the apostle and his companions in preaching the gospel, and to stir up the people and magistrates against them<sup>x</sup>. And this is no other than what the apostle himself fully declares in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, where, speaking of the Jews, he says, *Who both killed our Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us, and please not God, and are contrary to all men: forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved*<sup>y</sup>. He represents it as their general practice to hinder him and his companions from preaching to the Gentiles the great things of their salvation.

§. 11. We read in the History of the Acts, that St. Paul preached in the city of Corinth<sup>z</sup>. This is fully confirmed to us by the two Epistles he wrote

<sup>s</sup> Heb. x. 34.

<sup>t</sup> Ch. i. 4.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. xvii. 13, 14.

<sup>x</sup> See Acts xiii. 50. xiv. 5. 19. xviii. 12. and xix. 9.

<sup>y</sup> Ch. ii. 15, 16.

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xviii.

to the Corinthians <sup>a</sup>. We find also in the same History, that Apollos, a convert from among the Jews, an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures, did for a time teach at Corinth, after St. Paul had planted the gospel there <sup>b</sup>. This is confirmed by St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians: *Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered* <sup>c</sup>. Apollos was with St. Paul at Ephesus when he wrote this letter <sup>d</sup>. And many years after he orders Titus to bring him on his way <sup>e</sup>. Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, is mentioned in the Acts as one of St. Paul's converts at Corinth <sup>f</sup>. And in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul acknowledges that he had baptized Crispus <sup>g</sup>.

Sosthenes, another chief ruler of a synagogue, (whether he succeeded Crispus when he became a Christian, or was chief ruler of another synagogue in the same city; for probably there were several synagogues in so large a city,) is spoken of in the Acts as having been beaten by the Greeks before the judgment-seat <sup>h</sup>. The learned differ in their interpretation of this passage. Some take Sosthenes to have been at this time an enemy to the apostle Paul, and his accuser, though afterwards a convert to him; and that he was beaten by the unbelieving Greeks, in consequence of the opinion given by the

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 15. ix. 1, 2. xi. 2, 23. and xv. 1. 2 Cor. i. 15. xii. 14. and xiii. 12.

<sup>b</sup> Acts xviii. 27. and xix. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. i. 12. and iii. 4, 5, 6.

<sup>d</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

<sup>e</sup> Tit. iii. 13.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. xviii. 8.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. iv. 14.

<sup>h</sup> Ch. xviii. 17.

judge, and because he had troubled the proconsul with so impertinent a cause<sup>i</sup>. Others think, that he at this time favoured Christianity, and suffered for that reason, the Greeks beating him at the instigation of the unbelieving Jews<sup>k</sup>. However it were, he afterwards joined with St. Paul in sending the First Epistle to the Corinthians: *Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, and Sosthenes our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth*<sup>l</sup>.

We are informed in the Acts that St. Paul was bred to a handicraft trade, and exercised it both at Corinth and at Ephesus<sup>m</sup>. That he wrought at his trade in the city of Corinth, to the end he might not be burdensome to the new converts, and thereby prevent the success of the gospel, he more than once intimates in his Epistles to the Corinthians<sup>n</sup>. That he did the same at Ephesus, is also evident from his First Epistle to the Corinthians, where he says, *Even unto this present hour we labour, working with our own hands*<sup>o</sup>. For he dwelt at Ephesus when he wrote that Epistle<sup>p</sup>; and it was customary for him to do the same thing in other cities, as appears from his Epistles to the Thessalonians<sup>q</sup>.

§. 12. We read in the Acts that St. Paul lived a considerable time at Ephesus, preaching the gospel there, and that with very great success; and that a tumult being raised by Demetrius, he and his companions were in no little danger of being torn to

<sup>i</sup> Beza, Grotius, &c.      <sup>k</sup> Martyrologia, Chrysostom, Basnage,  
Ann. p. 654, pr. et fin.      <sup>l</sup> 1 Cor. i. 1.

<sup>m</sup> Ch. xviii. 3. and xx. 34.

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 6. 12. 15. 18.    2 Cor. xi. 7. 9. and xii. 13.

<sup>o</sup> Ch. iv. 11, 12.

<sup>p</sup> See 1 Cor. xvi. 8. 19.

<sup>q</sup> 1 Thess. ii. 9.    2 Thess. iii. 8.



pieces by the multitude, or thrown to the wild beasts<sup>r</sup>. In agreement herewith he says in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, *I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost. For a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries*<sup>s</sup>. And the tumult happening soon after he had sent away this Epistle, he informs them of it in the beginning of the Second: *We would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life*<sup>t</sup>.

We learn from the Acts that St. Paul went through the region of Galatia<sup>u</sup>. That he did not travel there as an idle spectator, but that he preached the gospel to the inhabitants, and made many converts, is evident from what is said in the same History upon his coming there a second time, *that he went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the churches*<sup>x</sup>. Agreeably hereto, St. Paul writes in his Epistle to the churches of Galatia, *Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at the first. And my temptation, which was in my flesh, ye despised not nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus—For I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me*<sup>y</sup>. That St. Paul and his companions were at Troas, and that upon his arrival there another time in his return from Macedonia, a church of Christians assembled on the first

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xix. 1. 9. 10. 19. 20. 29. 30.

<sup>s</sup> Ch. xvi. 8, 9.

<sup>t</sup> Ch. i. 8.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. xvi. 6.

<sup>x</sup> Ch. xviii. 23.

<sup>y</sup> Ch. iv. 13, 14, 15. and see ch. i. 6.

day of the week to break bread, and hear him preach, is related in the History of the Acts <sup>z</sup>. And he himself says in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, *Furthermore, when I came to Troas to preach Christ's gospel, and a door was opened unto me of the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother: but taking my leave of them, I went from thence into Macedonia* <sup>a</sup>. This happened when he left Ephesus upon the account of the tumult, and was upon his road to Macedonia. His calling there at this time is omitted by St. Luke <sup>b</sup>. It is probable he might make some few converts the first time of his being there. He had far greater success the second; for now he says *a door was opened unto him*; and upon his third coming, in his return from Greece and Macedonia, we read of a church of Christians assembled on the first day of the week.

§. 13. We have a large account in the Acts, that St. Paul, being apprehended by the Jews in the temple at Jerusalem, was rescued out of their hands by the chief captain Lysias. And being detained in prison more than two years in Judæa, was at length sent by Festus the governor to Rome, and lived there as a prisoner two years <sup>c</sup>. His imprisonment in Judæa is mentioned by himself in his Epistle to the Hebrews; *For ye had compassion of me in my bonds* <sup>d</sup>. His imprisonment at Rome is very frequently spoken of in his Epistles to Philemon <sup>e</sup>, the Colossians <sup>f</sup>, the Ephesians <sup>g</sup>, the Phi-

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xvi. 8. and xx. 6, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. ii. 12, 13.

<sup>b</sup> See Acts xx. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. xxi. and xxvii.

<sup>d</sup> Heb. x. 34.

<sup>e</sup> Ver. 9, 10, 13.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. iv. 3. 18.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. iii. 1. iv. 1. and vi. 20.

lippians<sup>h</sup>. In this last he says, *My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places*<sup>i</sup>. And afterwards in the same chapter, *Unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake; having the same conflict which ye saw in me, and now hear to be in me*<sup>k</sup>. Whence it appears that part of the church of Philippi were at this time in prison for the sake of the gospel. For this is the conflict, these are the sufferings, which they had seen the apostle undergo when he was among them at Philippi; and this is the conflict or sufferings which they now heard he underwent at Rome. And at the conclusion of the same Epistle it is said, *All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household*<sup>l</sup>.

§. 14. St. Paul is represented as saying in his defence before the Roman governor Felix, *Now after many years I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings*<sup>m</sup>. This is abundantly confirmed in his Epistles. Therein he gives directions to the churches that their alms may be ready, writing to the Corinthians thus: *Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. And when I come, whomsoever you shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem. And if it be meet that I go also, they shall go with me. Now I will*

<sup>h</sup> Ch. i. 7. and iv. 61.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. i. 13.

<sup>k</sup> Ver. 29, 30.

<sup>l</sup> Phil. iv. 22.

<sup>m</sup> Acts xxiv. 17.

*come unto you, when I shall pass through Macedonia*<sup>n</sup>. After this, that he might raise the emulation of the wealthy Corinthians, he sets before them the great readiness and cheerfulness which the poor Macedonians shewed in making their contributions when he came to them: *Moreover, brethren, we make known unto you the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For, to their power, I bear record, yea, and beyond their power they were willing of themselves; praying us with much entreaty that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints*<sup>o</sup>. And in his Epistle to the Romans declares, he was just then setting out from Corinth on his journey to Jerusalem on this errand: *But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. For it has pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem*<sup>p</sup>.

§. 15. There is not the least mention of the cities of Coloss or Laodicea in the History of the Acts, which History leaves St. Paul prisoner at Rome for the first time. During this imprisonment he wrote his Epistle to the Colossians. And in that declares, that he never had been either with them or at Laodicea. For thus he writes; *I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my*

<sup>n</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 1—5.    <sup>o</sup> 2 Cor. viii. 1—4. See also ch. ix. 1—5.

<sup>p</sup> Ch. xv. 25, 26. See Gal. ii. 10.

*face in the flesh*<sup>q</sup>. There is no account in the Acts of St. Paul's having been in Italy or at Rome till he was carried there a prisoner from Judæa. It is said indeed of him the last time he was at Ephesus, *Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome*<sup>r</sup>. This is exactly agreeable with what he writes in his Epistle to the Romans, which, as we observed before, was sent from Corinth when he was just entering upon his journey to Jerusalem with the collection for the poor saints. In the beginning of the Epistle he tells them, *it was his desire and prayer to come to them; that he longed to see them; that he had often purposed to come; and that, as much as in him lay, he was ready to preach the gospel to them that are at Rome also*<sup>s</sup>. And at the end of the Epistle says, it was his resolution to come to them immediately after he had been at Jerusalem: *Whenever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you—but now I go to Jerusalem to minister unto the saints—When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed unto them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain*<sup>t</sup>.

In the same Epistle he says, *From Jerusalem, round about to Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ*<sup>u</sup>. Which is a general confirmation of the whole history of his travels in the book of Acts. For in that History he is said to have gone through Syria, Cilicia, and most if not all

<sup>q</sup> Ch. ii. 1.<sup>r</sup> Acts xix. 21.<sup>s</sup> Rom. i. 10—15.<sup>t</sup> Ch. xv. 24—28.<sup>u</sup> Rom. xv. 19.



the countries in Peninsular Asia, to have come over into Europe, and to pass through Macedonia into Greece. Now Berœa, the last city in which St. Paul is said to have preached in Macedonia, could not be far from Dessaretia, which was part of the ancient Illyricum<sup>x</sup>. At the same time I must own, it does not seem at all improbable to me, that St. Paul might, in one of his journeys through Macedonia, (for St. Luke relates his passing through Macedonia three times,) make an excursion into some of the nearer parts of Illyricum, and plant the gospel among them, though not taken notice of in the History of the Acts<sup>y</sup>. It is certain, however, that during St. Paul's life the gospel was preached even in the remoter parts of Illyricum, and not improbably by the apostle himself after his release from his first imprisonment at Rome. For in his Second Epistle to Timothy, written when he was a second time prisoner in that great city, he informs him that he had sent Titus to Dalmatia<sup>z</sup>.

St. Paul says, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, *Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews*<sup>a</sup>. Of this we have three in-

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Cellar. N. O. Ant. l. 2. c. 13. vol. 1. p. 656—660.

<sup>y</sup> All that St. Luke says of his second journey is this: *And when he had gone over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece.* Acts xx. 2. All that is said of his third journey is, that whereas he intended to have sailed from Greece into Syria, knowing that the Jews laid wait for him, he changed his mind, and passed through Macedonia. Ver. 3, &c. At either of these times might he make an excursion into Illyricum, but most probably in his second journey.

<sup>z</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 10.

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 20.



stances in the Acts of the Apostles; his circumcising of Timothy <sup>b</sup>, his shaving his head at Cenchrea <sup>c</sup>, and purifying himself in the temple with those four men which had a vow on them <sup>d</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> Ch. xvi. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. xviii. 18.

<sup>d</sup> Ch. xxi. 24. 26.

## CHAP. XII.

*A further confirmation of principal facts.*

THROUGH the good providence of God there are some pieces yet extant, written by the persons concerned in the facts recorded in the History we are treating of, which contain an ample confirmation of almost all the things related therein, as I have already in great part made appear to you. I would now further observe the agreement there is between the Acts and the Epistles in the names and descriptions of St. Paul's fellow-labourers and converts.

§. 1. In the History of the Acts, Barnabas is joined with St. Paul in the commission given him to preach the gospel to the Gentiles<sup>a</sup>. And St. Paul, writing to the Galatians, says, *When James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision*<sup>b</sup>. It is related in the Acts, that Paul and Barnabas having preached to the Gentiles, and being returned to Antioch, after some time spent there, went up to Jerusalem to the apostles and elders to consult them whether it were necessary to circumcise the Gentile converts<sup>c</sup>? This journey is mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians: *Then fourteen years after* (i. e. after his conversion) *I*

<sup>a</sup> Ch. xiii. 2, 3, 4.<sup>b</sup> Gal. ii. 9. Vid. 1 Cor. ix. 6.<sup>c</sup> Acts xiv. 26. 28. and xv. 2.

went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles. And adds afterwards, that he would not suffer Titus, being a Greek, to be circumcised<sup>d</sup>.

When Paul and Barnabas were sent to the Gentiles, they took with them John, whose surname was Mark, to be their minister<sup>e</sup>; who left them after they had passed through the island of Cyprus<sup>f</sup>. When they were setting out a second time to preach to the Gentiles, and visit the churches they had planted, Barnabas determined to take Mark again with them; but Paul thought it not proper, because he had so soon quitted them, and went not with them to the work. Upon which they parted, Barnabas taking Mark, and sailing to Cyprus<sup>g</sup>. Mark is several times named in the Epistles. In one of them he is said to be sister's son to Barnabas<sup>h</sup>, which may explain to us the reason why Barnabas was so much set upon taking him with them. The apostle Peter, speaking of him, calls him my son<sup>i</sup>; probably because converted by him to the Christian faith. He was with St. Paul at Rome during his first imprisonment there, and had by that time fully regained his esteem. For both in his Epistle to Philemon<sup>k</sup>, and in that to the Colossians, he calls him his fellow-labourer<sup>l</sup>; and desires of the Colossians, that if he came among them, they would give him a kind reception. That, notwithstanding his

<sup>d</sup> Gal. ii. 1, 2, 3.

<sup>e</sup> Acts xii. 25. and xiii. 5.

<sup>f</sup> Ch. xiii. 13.

<sup>g</sup> Acts xv. 36, &c.

<sup>h</sup> Col. iv. 10.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Pet. v. 13.

<sup>k</sup> Ver. 24.

<sup>l</sup> Ch. iv. 11.

quitting Paul and Barnabas, he afterwards travelled over a great part of Asia Minor, or what is now called Anatolia, in order to establish the churches in the faith, and was thereby personally known to them, seems probable from the salutations sent from him to them by St. Peter in his Epistle<sup>m</sup>. And the great value that St. Paul retained for him even to the last, is expressed in his Second Epistle to Timothy: in which, not long before his martyrdom, and when all had forsaken him, he writes to Timothy thus: *Take Mark, and bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry*<sup>n</sup>.

When Paul and Barnabas parted, it is said in the History of the Acts, that *Paul took with him Silas*<sup>o</sup>, who is described as *a chief man among the brethren*<sup>p</sup>. There is frequent mention made of him as a companion of St. Paul in this his second journey to preach to the Gentiles<sup>q</sup>; and he is said to have been with him particularly at Corinth<sup>r</sup>, and at Thessalonica<sup>s</sup>. This doubtless is the same person who in the Epistles is named Sylvanus; for Silas is no other than a contraction of the Latin name Sylvanus, which manner of contraction is usual among the Greeks<sup>t</sup>. St. Paul, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, expressly says, that *the Son of God was preached among them by him and Sylvanus*<sup>u</sup>. Sylvanus is also joined with St. Paul in the two Epistles directed to the Thessalonians, which were sent to them from the city of Corinth the first time of St.

<sup>m</sup> 1 Pet. v. 13.<sup>n</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 11.<sup>o</sup> Ch. xv. 40.<sup>p</sup> Ch. xv. 22, 32.<sup>q</sup> Acts xvi. 19. 25. 29. and xvii. 10. 14. 15.<sup>r</sup> Acts xviii. 5.<sup>s</sup> Acts xvii. 4.<sup>t</sup> Vid. Wolfii Curæ in Act. xv. 27. and in Rom. xvi. 8. 14. Grot. in 2 Cor. i. 19. and Act. xiii. 9.<sup>u</sup> 2 Cor. i. 19.

Paul's being there<sup>x</sup>. Sylvanus is likewise named by St. Peter as the person by whom he sent his Epistle<sup>y</sup>; which Epistle is directed to the Christian converts in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia<sup>z</sup>. That Silas accompanied St. Paul through the region of Galatia, we are expressly informed in the History of the Acts<sup>a</sup>. It is highly probable he afterwards went through the other countries here mentioned, making of converts, and establishing them already made; for he is described by St. Peter as a faithful brother unto them<sup>b</sup>.

The next person mentioned in the History, as St. Paul's companion, is Timothy, a certain disciple whom he met at Lystra, *well reported of by the brethren there; him would Paul have to go forth with him*<sup>c</sup>. And we read of him as accompanying St. Paul in various places<sup>d</sup>. Agreeably hereto, St. Paul in his Epistles styles him his *work-fellow*<sup>e</sup>: *for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do*<sup>f</sup>. *Our brother and minister of God, and our fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ*<sup>g</sup>. And says to the Philippians, *Ye know the proof of him, that,*

<sup>x</sup> 1 Thess. i. 1. 2 Thess. i. 1. Compare 1 Thess. iii. 1. 2. 6. with Acts xvii. 14, 15. and xviii. 5.

<sup>y</sup> 1 Pet. v. 12.

<sup>z</sup> 1 Pet. i. 1. chiefly to the heathen converts. See 1 Pet. ii. 10. and iv. 3. Vid. Wolf. Cur. in 1 Pet. i. 1.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. xvi. 6.

<sup>b</sup> *A faithful brother unto you, as I suppose.* 1 Pet. v. 12. The words *ὡς λογίζομαι*, translated *as I suppose*, do not signify any doubt, but a judgment passed upon full evidence. Vid. Raphael. Annot. Xenoph. p. 202. Alberti Observ. p. 302. Rom. iii. 28. and viii. 18. Peter went through these countries preaching the gospel, and probably Sylvanus might accompany him. Vid. Hieronym. de Scriptor. Eccles. c. i. and Epiph. Hær. 27. n. 6.

<sup>c</sup> Acts xvi. 1, 2, 3.

<sup>d</sup> Acts xvii. 14. xviii. 5. xix. 22. and xx. 4.

<sup>e</sup> Rom. xvi. 21.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 10.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Thess. iii. 2.

as a son with the father, he hath served with me in the gospel<sup>b</sup>. In other places he calls him his son. In his Epistle to the Corinthians, *My beloved son, and faithful in the Lord*<sup>i</sup>. And in the Epistles he writes to him, *My own son in the faith, my dearly beloved son*<sup>k</sup>. We read in the History of the Acts, that Timothy was with St. Paul the first time he preached at Corinth<sup>l</sup>. The same thing is confirmed by St. Paul in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians<sup>m</sup>. We read also, that he was with him at Ephesus<sup>n</sup>. And the same appears from St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians<sup>o</sup>. We are told in the Acts, that he sent Timothy from Ephesus into Macedonia<sup>p</sup>. And we learn from St. Paul's Epistles, that he was several times employed by him as his messenger to the churches<sup>q</sup>; and particularly, that at the same time he was sent from Ephesus to Macedonia, he was to go also to Corinth<sup>r</sup>. We learn from St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, that he was with him, whatever part of Macedonia or Greece he was in, when he wrote that letter<sup>s</sup>: and that he accompanied him thence to Corinth, seems plain from his Epistle to the Romans<sup>t</sup>. And, agreeably hereto, we find him in the History of the Acts attending St. Paul from Greece into Asia, together with the other trustees, for the collection made for the poor saints in Judæa<sup>u</sup>. He was afterwards with St. Paul at

<sup>b</sup> Ch. ii. 22.      <sup>i</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 17.      <sup>k</sup> 1 Tim. i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Acts xviii. 5.      <sup>m</sup> Ch. i. 19.      <sup>n</sup> Acts xix. 22.

<sup>o</sup> Ch. iv. 17. This Epistle was written from Ephesus, as you may see ch. xvi. 8, 9.      <sup>p</sup> Acts xix. 22.

<sup>q</sup> 1 Thess. iii. 2. Phil. ii. 19. 23. 1 Tim. i. 3.

<sup>r</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 17.      <sup>s</sup> 2 Cor. i. 1.      <sup>t</sup> Ch. xvi. 21.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. xx. 4.



Rome<sup>x</sup>, was a prisoner about the time St. Paul was released, but soon after set at liberty<sup>y</sup>.

The next persons we read of in the History as St. Paul's companions, were Aquila and his wife Priscilla, who came from Rome, and settled at Corinth; in whose house at Corinth St. Paul took up his lodging, and wrought with them at their trade of tentmaking<sup>z</sup>. They afterwards accompanied St. Paul to Ephesus, and being left by him there, instructed Apollos in the doctrine of Christ more fully than he had been before taught it, and recommended him to the brethren at Corinth<sup>a</sup>. In agreement herewith St. Paul, when the second time at Ephesus, writing his First Epistle to the Corinthians from thence, sends their salutations: *Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house*<sup>b</sup>. Not long after they returned to Rome: for when St. Paul was at Corinth the second time, and wrote thence his Epistle to the Romans, he says, *Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus, who have for my life laid down their own necks; unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles. Likewise greet the church that is in their house*<sup>c</sup>. They had, it is probable, a considerable number of servants to carry on their trade; these doubtless were taught by them the Christian faith, by which means they had a church in their own house where-

<sup>x</sup> Phil. i. 1. Col. i. 1. Philem. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Heb. xiii. 23.

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xviii. 2, 3.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. ver. 18, 19. 24—27.

<sup>b</sup> Ch. xvi. 19.

<sup>c</sup> Rom. xvi. 3, 4, 5. It is not unlikely they might expose their lives to preserve that of St. Paul in the tumult made at Ephesus, or when he fought with the wild beasts there.

ever they settled. They were removed to Ephesus again, when St. Paul was a second time prisoner at Rome: for he sends his salutations to them in his Second Epistle to Timothy<sup>d</sup>.

It is said in the History of the Acts, that *St. Paul sent into Macedonia, from Ephesus, two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus<sup>e</sup>*. In St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans is mention made of Erastus as chamberlain of the city of Corinth<sup>f</sup>. And in his Second Epistle to Timothy he writes, *Erastus abode at Corinth<sup>g</sup>*. We read in the History, that Demetrius, and his workmen at Ephesus, seized upon *Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel<sup>h</sup>*. Agreeably hereto St. Paul, in his Epistle to Philemon, calls Aristarchus his *fellow-labourer<sup>i</sup>*. The same Aristarchus is said in the History to have accompanied St. Paul from Greece into Asia<sup>k</sup>, and afterwards from Judæa to Rome<sup>l</sup>. And that he was with St. Paul in his first imprisonment at Rome, appears from his Epistles: for he sends his salutations thence both to the Colossians and to Philemon; and in his Epistle to the former calls him his *fellow-prisoner<sup>m</sup>*. There is a Gaius also mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistles. In his First Epistle to the Corinthians he says that *he baptized Gaius<sup>n</sup>*: and in his Epistle to the Romans, which was written from Corinth, he calls him his *host; Gaius mine host, and of the whole church, saluteth you<sup>o</sup>*. This Gaius, from the

<sup>d</sup> Ch. iv. 19.<sup>e</sup> Ch. xix. 22.<sup>f</sup> Rom. xvi. 23.<sup>g</sup> Ch. iv. 20.<sup>h</sup> Acts xix. 29.<sup>i</sup> Ver. 24.<sup>k</sup> Acts xx. 4.<sup>l</sup> Acts xxvii. 2.<sup>m</sup> Philemon 24. Col. iv. 10.<sup>n</sup> Ch. i. 14.<sup>o</sup> Rom. xvi. 23.

description here given of him, seems to be the same person to whom St. John directs his Third Epistle <sup>p</sup>. But whether he be the same spoken of in the Acts is wholly uncertain, because it is a name that was very common at that time. And whether St. Luke meant the same person by the Gaius whom he describes as a Macedonian <sup>q</sup>, and the Gaius which he says was of the city of Derbe <sup>r</sup>, is equally uncertain. I am inclined to think they were two persons, though some have imagined that he might arise from a family in Derbe, be born or bred at Thessalonica, and have his settled habitation at Corinth <sup>s</sup>; a conjecture or invention arising wholly from an unwillingness to allow that there were two persons of the same name among St. Paul's companions, whereas it is certain there were more than one couple of the same name among the twelve chosen by our Lord <sup>t</sup>.

We read in the History of the Acts, that Sopater of Berea accompanied St. Paul from Greece to Asia <sup>u</sup>. And we find by the Epistle to the Romans, that Sosipater (which doubtless is the same name) was with St. Paul at Corinth, when he was setting out on that journey <sup>x</sup>. Tychicus went also with St. Paul from Greece into Asia <sup>y</sup>, and probably accompanied him in his voyage to Rome: for he is sent by St. Paul from Rome, when prisoner there the first time, with the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians: *But that ye also may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother, and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you*

<sup>p</sup> Vid. ver. 5, 6.

<sup>q</sup> Acts xix. 29.

<sup>r</sup> Acts xx. 4.

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Benson in loc.

<sup>t</sup> Matt. x. 2, 3, 4.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. xx. 4.

<sup>x</sup> Ch. xvi. 21.

<sup>y</sup> Acts xx. 4.

*all things, whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts*<sup>z</sup>. Trophimus was another who went with St. Paul out of Greece into Asia<sup>a</sup>, and is mentioned in the History as being with him at Jerusalem<sup>b</sup>. All that we find of him in the Epistles is, that he was with St. Paul in the island of Crete after his release from his first imprisonment at Rome. For he tells Timothy in his Second Epistle, *Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick*<sup>c</sup>. It is evident from the style, that St. Luke, the author of the History of the Acts, accompanied St. Paul from Greece into Asia<sup>d</sup>, and afterwards from Jerusalem to Rome<sup>e</sup>. And we accordingly learn, from the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, that he was with him at Rome: for he sends his salutation to both, styling him in the one Epistle *the beloved physician*<sup>f</sup>, in the other his *fellow-labourer*<sup>g</sup>. He was also with St. Paul during his second imprisonment at Rome: for he writes to Timothy in his Second Epistle, *Only Luke is with me*<sup>h</sup>.

§. 2. St. Peter is represented in the History of the Acts as saying to the Jews, *Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities*<sup>i</sup>: and St. Paul, *It was necessary that the word of God should have been first spoken unto you: but seeing ye put it from you, lo, we turn to*

<sup>z</sup> Eph. vi. 21, 22. Col. iv. 7, 8.

<sup>a</sup> Acts xx. 4.

<sup>b</sup> Acts xxi. 29.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. iv. 20.

<sup>d</sup> Acts xx. 5, 6, 13. and xxi. 1, &c.

<sup>e</sup> Acts xxvii. 1, &c.

<sup>f</sup> Col. iv. 14.

<sup>g</sup> Philem. 24.

<sup>h</sup> Ch. iv. 11.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. iii. 26.

*the Gentiles<sup>k</sup>: and in another place, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles<sup>l</sup>. And our Saviour is introduced as saying to his disciples, But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth<sup>m</sup>. Agreeably hereto, we find in the Gospel of St. Matthew, that the first commission given by our Saviour to his disciples was restrained to the Jews: Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel<sup>n</sup>. After his resurrection the commission was extended to all nations<sup>o</sup>. And St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, alluding hereto, says, I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek<sup>p</sup>.*

In the History of the Acts our Saviour says to his disciples, that *they should be witnesses unto him unto the uttermost part of the earth<sup>q</sup>: and St. Paul to the Athenians, But now God commandeth all men every where to repent<sup>r</sup>: and unto the Jews at Antioch in Pisidia, Lo, we turn to the Gentiles: for so hath the Lord commanded, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation to the ends of the earth<sup>s</sup>. And, agreeably hereto, we find in the Gospels of St.*

<sup>k</sup> Ch. xiii. 46.<sup>l</sup> Ch. xviii. 6.<sup>m</sup> Ch. i. 8.<sup>n</sup> Matt. x. 5, 6. See also ch. xv. 24.<sup>o</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19.<sup>p</sup> Ch. i. 16.<sup>q</sup> Ch. i. 8.<sup>r</sup> Acts xvii. 30.<sup>s</sup> Acts xiii. 46, 47.

Matthew and St. Mark, that the disciples were enjoined by our Lord *to go teach all nations<sup>t</sup>, to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature<sup>u</sup>*. And St. Mark informs us that they actually did so: *They went forth and preached every where<sup>x</sup>*. We learn the same also from the Epistles of St. Paul, who writes to the Romans, that *the sound of the gospel preachers was gone into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world<sup>y</sup>*. And in another place, that *the gospel mystery is made known to all nations<sup>z</sup>*. And to the Colossians, that *the gospel was preached to every creature which is under heaven<sup>a</sup>*.

That the gospel was spread through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, St. Peter is witness, who directs his Epistles to the Christians inhabiting those parts<sup>b</sup>. That it had also reached Babylon, is evident from the salutation of that church which he sends to the Christians to whom his Epistle is directed<sup>c</sup>. Tacitus the Roman historian, a heathen, informs us, that at the time when Nero burnt the city, i. e. about the time when St. Peter and St. Paul were put to death, or, it may be, a year or two before, there were many Christians at Rome, *ingens multitudo*, a large multitude were informed against as being Christians<sup>d</sup>. Clemens Romanus, mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians as *his fellow-labourer, whose name was written in the book of life<sup>e</sup>*, not long after the apostle's decease, sent an epistle in the name of the

<sup>t</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19.

<sup>u</sup> Mark xvi. 15.

<sup>x</sup> Ver. 20.

<sup>y</sup> Ch. x. 18.

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xvi. 25, 26.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. i. 6. 23.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Pet. i. 1.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Pet. v. 13.

<sup>d</sup> Ann. l. 15. c. 44.

<sup>e</sup> Ch. iv. 3.



church of Christ at Rome to the church of Corinth, in which he says, that “ St. Paul preached both in  
 “ the east and in the west, taught the whole world  
 “ righteousness, and travelled to the utmost bounds  
 “ of the west <sup>f</sup>.” And in another epistle to the same church intimates that the Christians were become more numerous than the Jews <sup>g</sup>. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch in Syria, who was sent by the emperor Trajan to Rome, in order to be exposed to the wild beasts, in his way thither was met by the bishops, elders, and other messengers of various churches. The epistles which he wrote upon this occasion to the churches at Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, are yet extant. In that to the Ephesians he speaks of bishops as appointed unto the utmost bounds of the earth <sup>h</sup>. Pliny, a heathen author, who was governor of Bithynia, a Roman province under the emperor Trajan, writing to the emperor, informs him, “ that there were many  
 “ Christians of every age, of every rank, and of both  
 “ sexes, in the province ; that the Christian religion  
 “ was spread not only in the cities, but through the  
 “ villages and countries ; that their temples were  
 “ forsaken, their sacred solemnities omitted, and  
 “ that there was seldom found any one to buy their  
 “ sacrifices <sup>i</sup>.”

Justin Martyr, who wrote his Apology for the Christians about the year of Christ 140, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, says, “ that there is no  
 “ sort of men whatsoever, whether Barbarians or  
 “ Greeks, or by what names soever they are called,

<sup>f</sup> §. 5.

<sup>g</sup> §. 2. Ἐπεὶ ἔρημος ἐδόκει εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ λαὸς ἡμῶν· νυνὶ δὲ πιστεύσαντες, πλείονες ἐγενόμεθα τῶν δοκούντων ἔχειν Θεόν.

<sup>h</sup> §. 3, fin.

<sup>i</sup> L. 10. ep. 91.

“ whether they be such as are said to dwell in wag-  
 “ gons, or without houses, or are such as dwell in  
 “ tents, and feed cattle, there is no sort among whom  
 “ prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the  
 “ Father and Maker of all things through the name  
 “ of the crucified Jesus<sup>k</sup>.” Irenæus, who flourished  
 not many years after, and had, when a youth, been  
 a hearer of Polycarp, who was ordained bishop of  
 Smyrna by the apostles<sup>l</sup>, speaks of the Christian  
 church as spread through the whole world to the  
 utmost ends of the earth<sup>m</sup>. “ Neither,” says he,  
 “ have the churches which are seated in Germany  
 “ received or delivered down any other faith, neither  
 “ the churches which are in Spain, nor those which  
 “ are in France, nor those in the east, nor those in  
 “ Egypt, nor those in Libya, neither those which  
 “ are placed in the midst of the world<sup>n</sup>.” Again ;  
 “ The vineyard is not now fenced in, but spread  
 “ through the whole world, the church is renowned  
 “ every where, the winepress is dug in all places,  
 “ and there are in every place those who receive the  
 “ Spirit<sup>o</sup>.” And fully intimates that there were  
 Christians in Cæsar’s court<sup>p</sup>.

Clemens Alexandrinus, who flourished in the same  
 century, and received the Christian doctrine from  
 those who immediately succeeded the apostles<sup>q</sup>,  
 speaks of the knowledge of Christ as being spread

<sup>k</sup> P. 345, C.

<sup>l</sup> Iren. l. 3. c. 3. §. 4. Euseb. H. E. l. 3.

c. 36, pr.

<sup>m</sup> L. 1. c. 10. §. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. §. 2.

<sup>o</sup> L. 4. c. 36. §. 2.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. c. 30. §. 1. Quid autem et hi, qui in regali aula sunt,  
 fideles, nonne ex iis, quæ Cæsar’s sunt, habent utensilia ?

<sup>q</sup> Strom. l. 1. p. 322. Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 13.

through the world swifter than the sunbeams<sup>r</sup>: and says of the Christian faith, “There is not a place “where it is not<sup>s</sup>.” And again; “The doctrine of “our Master did not continue in Judæa alone, as “philosophy in Greece, but was spread through the “whole world, persuading whole houses, and every “one singly of those who hearkened to it in every “nation and town, and in every city both of Greeks “and Barbarians, bringing over to the truth not a “few of the philosophers themselves<sup>t</sup>.”

Tertullian, who flourished at the same time, in the Apology which he makes for the Christians, addressed to the Roman powers<sup>u</sup>, says, “We are but “of yesterday, notwithstanding we have filled all “things that belong to you, your cities, your isles, “your forts, your municipia, your councils, the camp “itself, your tribes, your decuries, the palace, the “senate, the forum; we have left you only your “temples. Had we broke off from you, and gone “to some remote part of the world, you would have “been confounded at the loss of so great a number “of subjects, and our very forsaking you would have “been a punishment. Without doubt you would “have been affrighted at your own solitude, at the “cessation of business, at the silence and astonish- “ment thence arising, and would have been to seek “for persons whom you might govern<sup>x</sup>.” In another place he speaks of Christians as being almost

<sup>r</sup> Cohort. ad Gentes, p. 3. l. 17. p. 86. l. 10, &c.

<sup>s</sup> Strom. l. 2. p. 445. l. 8.

<sup>t</sup> Strom. l. 6. p. 827. l. 10.

<sup>u</sup> Si non licet vobis, Romani imperii antistites, in aperto et edito, in ipso fere vertice civitatis præsidentibus ad judicandum, palam dispicere, &c.

<sup>x</sup> C. 37.

the major part of every city in Africa, more particularly of Carthage; and intimates, that persons even of the highest rank in that city were Christians<sup>v</sup>. And in his book against the Jews, “In what other person have all nations believed, unless in Christ, who is already come? Whom else have the nations believed? *The Parthians, the Medes, the Elamites, the dwellers in Mesopotamïa, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, and the inhabitants of Pontus, Asia, and Pamphylia, those who live in Egypt, and the country of Afric beyond Cyrene; and the strangers of Rome, and the Jews then at Jerusalem, and the rest of the nations. As now the different sorts of the Getuli, the many coasts of the Mauri, all the countries of Spain, and the several nations of Gaul, and the places of the Britons, inaccessible to the Romans, but subject to Christ, and of the Sarmatæ, and of the Daci, and of the Germans, and of the Scythians, and of many nations added to them<sup>z</sup>, and of many provinces and islands unknown to us, and which we cannot enumerate. In all which places the name of Christ, who is already come, reigns.*” And a little after, “The name and reign of Christ is extended every where<sup>a</sup>.”

Origen, who succeeded Clemens Alexandrinus in the catechetical school at Alexandria, and flourished in the beginning of the third century, writing against

<sup>v</sup> Ad Scapulam, c. 2, prop. fin. et 5.

<sup>z</sup> In Pamelius it is, Et abditarum multarum gentium; but in Rigaltius, *additarum*, which I think the better reading of the two.

<sup>a</sup> *Adv. Judæos*, c. 7. Christi regnum et nomen ubique porrigitur, ubique creditur, ab omnibus gentibus supra enumeratis colitur, ubique regnat, ubique adoratur.

Celsus, tells him, “ That the whole world almost understands the Christian doctrine much better than the opinions of the philosophers. For who is ignorant that Jesus was born of a virgin, and was crucified, and rose again? Who is ignorant of the judgment preached, which will punish sinners, and reward the righteous, as they have deserved? Even the doctrine of the resurrection, though laughed at by those who believe not, is commonly known<sup>b</sup>.” And again; “ We see that the voice of the apostles of Jesus is gone out into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world<sup>c</sup>.” And again; “ Who will not be astonished, that, going back to the gospel history, hears Jesus, when on earth, teaching and saying, *This gospel shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony to them, and to the Gentiles*; when he sees, according to what was foretold by him, *the gospel preached in every part under heaven, both to Greeks and Barbarians, to the wise and the unwise*? For the word, being spoken with power, hath vanquished the whole human nature, nor is there any sort of men which have not received the doctrine of Jesus<sup>d</sup>.” It were easy to proceed, and bring more testimonies of this sort, but these shall suffice<sup>e</sup>.

<sup>b</sup> L. 1. p. 7. Σχεδὸν παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου ἐγνωκότες τὸ κήρυγμα Χριστιανῶν μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ἀρέσχοντα· τίνα γὰρ, κ. τ. λ.

<sup>c</sup> P. 48, fin. et 49, pr.

<sup>d</sup> L. 2. p. 68, fin. 69, pr. Οὐκ ἔστι τι γένος ἰδεῖν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἐκπέφηνγε παραδέξασθαι τὴν Ἰησοῦ διδασκαλίαν.

<sup>e</sup> Quis locus in terra est, quem non Christi possederit nomen? Qua sol oritur, qua occidit, qua erigitur septentrio, qua vergit auster, totum venerandi numinis majestas implevit. Firmicus de

§. 3. We have observed from the History of the Acts, that the preaching of the gospel met with much opposition in almost every place, and that the Christians suffered severe persecution; and have shewn that this is abundantly confirmed in the Epistles of St. Paul <sup>f</sup>. The same thing is evident from the First Epistle of St. Peter, who speaks of the Christians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, as at that time under great trials and sufferings <sup>g</sup>; and exhorts them, not to think that some strange or uncommon thing had happened to them, but what usually befell all who professed themselves Christians, *knowing, that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren, which are in the world*. And also from the Epistle of St. James, who says to the Christians, *Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment seats* <sup>h</sup>? and exhorts them to a patient bearing of sufferings, after the example of the holy prophets <sup>i</sup>. We find the same thing fully confirmed by the heathen writers of that time. Suetonius, who wrote the Lives of the twelve Cæsars, informs us, that Nero inflicted punishments on the Christians, whom he describes as a sort of men that held a new superstition <sup>k</sup>.

Tacitus, the Roman historian, is more particular, telling us, “ that Nero, neither by his acts of generosity, nor by the methods he took to appease the

Errore profan. Religionum, p. 42. Vid. et Observat. Elmenhorstii in Arnob. p. 51.

<sup>f</sup> Heb. x. 32, &c. xii. 4, &c. xiii. 3. Gal. iii. 4. 1 Cor. iv. 9—13.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Pet. i. 6, 7. iii. 14. 16, 17. iv. 12, 13. and v. 9, 10.

<sup>h</sup> Ch. ii. 6.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. v. 10, 11.

<sup>k</sup> Afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ. Ner. 16. 3. 11.



“ gods, being able to soften the people, and silence  
“ the report that the city was set on fire by his com-  
“ mand, to put an end to this rumour, procured that  
“ the Christians should be accused of burning it, as  
“ knowing them to be persons universally hated  
“ upon the account of their religion ; and therefore,  
“ that any crimes, how gross soever, laid to their  
“ charge, would be easily and readily believed ; and  
“ inflicted on them the most exquisite punishments.  
“ The first who were taken up, having confessed  
“ themselves Christians, afterwards a great multi-  
“ tude by their information were added to them,  
“ not so much because they were guilty of burning  
“ the city, but because of the hatred of mankind  
“ against them. Scoffs were added to their miseries  
“ while dying. They were clothed with the skins  
“ of wild beasts, and torn to pieces by the dogs : or  
“ else they were crucified, or being spread all over  
“ with combustible matter, were set on fire ; and  
“ when daylight was in, were made use of for noc-  
“ turnal lights. Nero gave up his own garden for  
“ this spectacle, and exhibited the games of the  
“ circus, mixed with the crowd in the habit of a  
“ charioteer, or standing in a chariot. Hence com-  
“ passion arose towards the sufferers, though cri-  
“ minal, and deserving to be made examples of the  
“ severest punishments, as being put to death, not  
“ for the sake of public utility, but to gratify the  
“ cruelty of a single person.” It is not improbable  
that Tacitus himself was an eyewitness of what he  
here relates. In the same place he informs us that  
the Christian religion had its rise in Judæa, and  
spread from thence to the city of Rome<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Annal. l. 15. 44. p. 662.

Eusebius tells us that the Christian doctrine shone with so great lustre in the reign of Domitian, that even the heathen authors<sup>m</sup> did not think much to give an account in their histories of the persecution and martyrdoms that happened at the latter end of his time. They write, that together with many others, Flavia Domitilla, niece of the consul Clemens, was banished to the island of Pontia, for confessing herself a Christian<sup>n</sup>. And this is confirmed by Dion Cassius, who, in the remains we have of him from Xiphilinus, says, that the crime laid to her charge was atheism<sup>o</sup>; a crime usually imputed to the Christians by the heathen, because they refused to sacrifice to their gods<sup>p</sup>. Dion says, that Clemens the consul was put to death, charged with the same crime. And from the description given him by Suetonius<sup>q</sup>, it is not a little probable that he was a Christian.

Pliny, governor of Bithynia, writes to the emperor Trajan, that “forasmuch as he had never  
“ been present at the trials of Christians, he was at  
“ a loss to know how far they were wont to be pun-  
“ ished. He was in doubt whether there ought not  
“ to be a difference made with regard to the age of  
“ the persons, and whether there ought not to be  
“ room left for repentance; whether the name of  
“ Christian, though free from crime, should itself be

<sup>m</sup> Bruttius is cited as one of these in his Canon Chron. ad an. 2112.

<sup>n</sup> E. H. l. 3. c. 18.

<sup>o</sup> L. 67. p. 766, A.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 13. Athenag. p. 4. Not. Spencer. ad Orig. p. 4.

<sup>q</sup> Contemptissimæ inertiae. Dom. 15. 1. Tertullian says, Alio quoque injuriarum titulo postulamus, et infructuosi in negotiis dicimur. Apol. c. 42, pr. Vid. Pitisci not. in Sueton.

“punished, or the crimes adhering to the name.” He then relates to the emperor the manner he had proceeded in: “I asked them, whether they were Christians? If they confessed it, I asked them a second and a third time, threatening to punish them. If they persevered in the confession, I ordered them to be put to death. For whatever were the thing they confessed, I had no manner of doubt with myself that stubbornness and inflexible obstinacy ought to be punished. There were others of like madness, whom, because they were Roman citizens, I marked down to be sent to the city.” He afterwards acquaints the emperor, that although he had examined some of them by torture, “he could find them guilty of nothing but a perverse and excessive superstition<sup>r</sup>.” So he calls their persisting in a denial to sacrifice to idols, and resolute adherence to the worship of Christ. Their constancy and fidelity to their Saviour is, in the eye of a heathen, an obstinate and unbounded superstition. Trajan, in the answer he writes to Pliny, approves his conduct, and decrees, “that for the future Christians should not be sought for; but if they were accused and convicted, they should be punished. Nevertheless, if they would deny themselves to be Christians, and supplicate the heathen deities, they should be pardoned<sup>s</sup>.”

Joannes Malela has preserved a letter of Tiberianus, governor of Palæstina Prima, directed to the same emperor, wherein he tells him, “that he was wearied out in punishing the Christians, and put-

<sup>r</sup> Sed nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam.

<sup>s</sup> L. 10. ep. 97, 98.

“ting them to death; that they came and informed  
 “against themselves, that they might suffer death;  
 “and though he took pains with them, exhorting  
 “and threatening them, they still continued that  
 “practice<sup>t</sup>.” Upon which Trajan ordered that no  
 more Christians should be put to death.

Serennius Granianus, proconsul of Asia, wrote to the emperor Adrian, “that it appeared not just to  
 “him to put the Christians to death, to gratify the  
 “clamours of the people, without any crime being  
 “laid to their charge, and without a hearing.” And the emperor decreed, that for the future Christians should not suffer, unless convicted of some crime against the laws. This rescript of the emperor to Minucius Fundanus, who succeeded Serennius, is mentioned both by Justin Martyr and by Melito, in the Apologies which they offered for the Christians to the emperor Marcus Antoninus<sup>u</sup>.

This emperor, in an epistle he wrote to the states of Asia, says, “that his father received letters from  
 “many governors of provinces concerning the Chris-  
 “tians: to whom he wrote in answer not to dis-  
 “turb them, unless they attempted any thing against  
 “the state: and that many had sent to himself con-  
 “cerning them, and that he returned answer ac-  
 “cording to the decree made by his father.” He adds, “Should any notwithstanding continue to give  
 “trouble to the Christians as such, let him that is  
 “accused be freed from the indictment, although it  
 “appear that he be a Christian, and let the accuser

<sup>t</sup> Chronographia, p. 356. Ἀπέκαμον τιμωρούμενος καὶ φονεύων τοὺς Γαλιλαίους.

<sup>u</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 8, 9. 26. Just. Mart. p. 99.

“ be punished <sup>x</sup>.” Epictetus the philosopher<sup>y</sup>, Arrian his scholar, Lucian the dialogist<sup>z</sup>, and M. Antoninus the emperor and philosopher<sup>a</sup>, all of them mention the readiness of Christians to lay down their lives for their profession, and blame it as inconsiderateness, rashness, obstinacy, madness.

It is needless to add to these the testimonies of Christian writers. It were easy otherwise to transcribe the apologies that were made by them to the powers then in being, and to lay before you a long list of sufferers, together with the various kinds of tortures inflicted, from the ancient martyrologies:

<sup>x</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 13. et Just. Mart. p. 100.

<sup>y</sup> Εἶτα ὑπὸ μανίας μὲν δύναταί τις οὕτω διατεθῆναι πρὸς ταῦτα, καὶ ὑπὸ ἔθους οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι. Arrian. Epict. l. 4. c. 7.

<sup>z</sup> Πεπεῖκασι γὰρ αὐτοὺς οἱ κακοδαίμονες, τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀθάνατοι ἑσέσθαι, καὶ βιώσεσθαι τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον· παρ’ ὃ καὶ καταφρονοῦσι τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ ἐκόντες αὐτοὺς ἐπιδιδόασιν οἱ πολλοί. De Morte Peregrini, p. 763, fin. et 764. In the same place Lucian confirms what is related in the Acts, that the Christians had all things in common, Acts ii. 44. and iv. 32, 34. \*Ἐπειτα δὲ ὁ νομοθέτης ὁ πρῶτος ἔπεισεν αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἀδελφοὶ πάντες εἶεν ἀλλήλων· ἐπειδὴν ἅπαξ προβάντες, θεοὺς μὲν τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς ἀπαρνήσωνται, τὸν δὲ ἀνεσκολοπισμένον ἐκείνον σοφιστὴν αὐτῶν προσκυνῶσι, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐκείνου νόμους βιώσι· καταφρονοῦσιν οὖν ἀπάντων ἐξ ἴσης καὶ κοινὰ ἡγοῦνται. P. 764. He also describes, in the most lively manner, the great readiness of Christians in that age to assist and support each other when under persecution: \*Ἐπεὶ δ’ οὖν ἐδέδετο, οἱ Χριστιανοὶ συμφορὰν ποιούμενοι τὸ πρᾶγμα, πάντα ἐκίνουν ἐξαρκάσαι πειρώμενοι αὐτόν· εἴτ’ ἐπεὶ τοῦτο ἦν ἀδύνατον, ἤγε ἄλλη θεραπεί· πᾶσα οὐ παρέργως, ἀλλὰ ξὺν σπουδῇ ἐγίγνετο· καὶ ἔωθεν μὲν εὐθὺς ἦν ὄρᾳ παρὰ τῷ δεσμοτερίῳ περιμένοντα γραῖδια, χήρας τινάς, καὶ παιδία ὀρφανὰ οἱ δὲ ἐν τέλει αὐτῶν, καὶ συνεκάθειδον ἔνδον μετ’ αὐτοῦ, διαφθείροντες τοὺς δεσμοφύλακας· εἶτα δεῖπνα ποικίλα εἰσεκομίζετο, καὶ λόγοι ἱεροὶ αὐτῶν ἐλέγοντο, κ. τ. λ. P. 762, fin. 763.

<sup>a</sup> Μὴ κατὰ ψιλὴν παράταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί, ἀλλὰ λελογισμένως i. e. Non ab obstinatione mera pro Christianorum more, sed ut mortem obeas considerate composite, &c. De Rebus suis, l. 11. §. 3

I shall therefore mention but one passage or two. Clemens of Alexandria, who had a thorough knowledge of what the philosophers taught, than whom no one was better read in the Greek learning, says, “Should any magistrate forbid the Greek philosophy, it would immediately vanish. But our doctrine, even from the first preaching it, both kings and tyrants, and tetrarchs and governors, together with all their guards, and infinite numbers of men forbade, warring against us, and endeavouring what in them lies to cut us off; but it flourishes even the more. For it does not die away as a human doctrine, but remains as what cannot be hindered<sup>b</sup>.” Celsus, having compared the danger which Christians underwent to that which befell Socrates, Origen answers, “that the Athenians immediately repented of what they had done to Socrates. And as to Pythagoras, there was no grudge retained against him after his death, and the Pythagoreans had their schools for a long time in Magna Græcia. But as for the Christians, the Roman senate, the emperors, the army, the people, and the relations of those who believe, made war against the Christian doctrine, and would have suppressed it, vanquished by the onset of so great a number, had it not by a divine power kept up its head, and gained ground, so as to overcome the whole world, which rose up against it<sup>c</sup>.”

<sup>b</sup> Strom. l. 6. p. 827. l. 16.

<sup>c</sup> L. I. p. 5, fin. et p. 6.



## CHAP. XIII.

*A further confirmation of principal facts.*

IT is related in the History of the Acts, that our Saviour *went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil<sup>a</sup>; that he was approved of God by miracles, wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of the Jewish nation<sup>b</sup>*: that after his ascension to heaven, he conferred the Holy Ghost on his disciples, and enabled them to do the greatest works<sup>c</sup>; that according to the commission he had given them, they went forth to preach the gospel, and usually wrought signs and wonders wherever they came, and communicated the miraculous gifts of the Spirit to their converts. These things, I have already shewn, are fully confirmed by the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. John, and by the Epistles of the apostles Paul, Peter, and James. It remains, that I shew how far they are confirmed by other writers.

That such gifts as these were certainly exercised in the first ages of Christianity, we have as many witnesses as there were converts to the Christian religion. For can it be imagined that persons would forsake the religious customs and practices they had been educated in, and embrace the Christian tenets, and this with the loss of all that was dear to them, and with the utmost hazard of their lives, if they had not seen the wonders wrought which we are speaking of? We have also the ex-

<sup>a</sup> Ch. x. 38.<sup>b</sup> Ch. ii. 22.<sup>c</sup> Ch. ii. 33.

press testimony of most, if not all the Christians, who have left any thing in writing behind them. St. Barnabas, who was the companion of the apostle Paul, in that short Epistle of his, which yet remains, speaking of Christ, says, “And finally teaching the people of Israel, and doing many signs and wonders among them, he preached to them, and shewed the exceeding great love which he bare towards them<sup>d</sup>.” Quadratus, in an Apology which he made for the Christians, and presented to the emperor Adrian, affirms, “that our Saviour’s works were real and durable; that the persons who were healed and raised to life by him continued living and well, not only during his life, but after his decease, for a long space of time, so that some of them have reached even to our days<sup>e</sup>;” i. e. to the first part of the life of Quadratus, if not also of the emperor Adrian. Justin Martyr, in the Apology he offered for the Christians to the emperor Antoninus, and the Roman senate, says, “And that our Christ should heal all manner of diseases, and raise the dead, was prophesied. Hear ye the words: *At his coming the lame shall leap as the stag, and the tongue of the dumb shall be eloquent; the blind shall receive their sight, and the lepers shall be cleansed, and the dead shall be raised, and shall walk.* And that he did these things, you may learn from the memoirs or registers of what happened under Pontius Pilate<sup>f</sup>.”

Tertullian, in his Apology, directed to the Roman magistrates, says of Christ, “that he by a

<sup>d</sup> §. 5.

<sup>e</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 3.

<sup>f</sup> Apol. 2. p. 84, b. c. Vid. et p. 76, c.

“ word’s speaking cast out devils, gave sight to the  
 “ blind, cleansed the lepers, healed the paralytic, re-  
 “ stored the dead to life by a word; made the ele-  
 “ ments themselves obedient, calming the storms,  
 “ and walking upon the seas.” He afterwards adds,  
 “ that all these things did Pilate make known to  
 “ Tiberius Cæsar<sup>g</sup>.” Lucian the martyr also boldly  
 appeals to the Roman Annals in the speech which  
 he made to the emperor Maximinus at Nicomedia  
 concerning the miraculous appearances at our Lord’s  
 crucifixion<sup>h</sup>. Clemens of Alexandria makes frequent  
 mention of the miracles performed by our Saviour  
 and his disciples. In one place he says, “ A proof  
 “ that the Son of God was our Saviour, are the pro-  
 “ phecies which went before, proclaiming him; also  
 “ the testimonies concerning him which accompanied  
 “ his birth. Moreover, after his ascension, his mira-  
 “ culous powers both preached and openly shewn<sup>i</sup> :”  
 in another place, having enumerated from the apostle  
 Paul the gifts of the Holy Spirit, asserts of the apo-  
 stles, “ that they were filled with all these gifts<sup>k</sup>.”

Origen, in his book against Celsus, says, “ that  
 “ persons were at the beginning made Christians by  
 “ miracles, being induced more by the wonders they  
 “ saw wrought to leave the religious customs and  
 “ tenets they had been educated in, and make choice

<sup>g</sup> C. 21. p. 20, B. et fin. Vid. et c. 5. p. 6, C.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. Huet. Dem. Evang. p. 30, C. This speech is preserved  
 in Ruffinus.

<sup>i</sup> Strom. l. 6. §. 15. p. 801. l. 17.

<sup>k</sup> Strom. l. 4. §. 21. p. 625. l. 13. Vid. et Pæd. l. 1. c. 2. p. 101,  
 pr. et c. 10. p. 151. l. 31. et Strom. l. 2. §. 11. p. 454. l. 32. et  
 l. 4. §. 5. p. 575. l. 23. et l. 6. §. 6. p. 762. l. 31. et p. 764. l. 19.  
 et p. 827, pr. et Prophet. Eclog. p. 993. §. 15, 16.

“ of others quite foreign from their own, than by  
 “ teaching and exhortation : for if it behove us to  
 “ use the appearance of reason concerning the first  
 “ gathering of the Christian church, we shall say,  
 “ that it is not credible, either that the apostles of  
 “ Jesus, being private and illiterate persons, should  
 “ have the boldness to preach to men the Christian  
 “ religion any other way than by the miraculous  
 “ works bestowed upon them, and the gift of ut-  
 “ terance, that they might open and explain its doc-  
 “ trines and institutions in an easy and intelligible  
 “ manner ; or indeed that those who heard them  
 “ should be changed from their own country man-  
 “ ners and customs, which had been practised among  
 “ them for many ages, to others so foreign and dif-  
 “ ferent from the opinions which they had been  
 “ educated in, without some very great power and  
 “ miraculous operations moving them thereto<sup>1</sup>.”  
 Arnobius, writing to the heathen, who imputed our  
 Saviour’s miracles to art magic, says to them, “ Can  
 “ ye shew, can ye point out any one of all the ma-  
 “ gicians that ever were in the world who has done  
 “ any thing like to Christ, even the thousandth  
 “ part<sup>m</sup> ?”

The Christian writers of the first ages not only  
 thus mention the wonderful works wrought by our  
 Saviour and his apostles, but they assure us also,  
 that the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit were  
 continued down to them, and that many great and  
 miraculous works were performed in their time.

<sup>1</sup> L. 8. p. 408, paulo infra med.

<sup>m</sup> Potestis aliquem nobis designare, monstrare ex omnibus illis  
 magis, qui unquam fuere per sæcula, consimile aliquid Christo  
 millesima ex parte qui fecerit ? l. 1. p. 25.

Clemens Romanus sufficiently intimates that these gifts were in the church of Corinth at the time he wrote to them<sup>n</sup>. Ignatius plainly signifies the same thing of the church of Smyrna in the Preface of his Epistle to them<sup>o</sup>. Ignatius himself<sup>p</sup> and Polycarp<sup>q</sup> were both endued with the spirit of prophecy: and so was Quadratus<sup>r</sup>. Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, says, “With us “the prophetical gifts remain even to this day<sup>s</sup>.” And a few pages after, “With us are to be seen “both men and women having gifts from the Spirit “of God<sup>t</sup>.” And in one of his Apologies presented to the Roman emperor and senate, he says, “that “Jesus Christ came into the world for the benefit “of those who believe, and for the destruction of “demons, you may even now learn from those “things which happen under your view. For many “of our Christians, adjuring the demons by the

<sup>n</sup> Ep. 1. §. 48. Vid. Wake's Præf. p. 116.

<sup>o</sup> Ἐλεημένη ἐν παντὶ χαρίσματι——ἀνυστερήτῳ οὐσῇ παντὸς χαρίσμα-  
τος.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Philad. §. 7. Trall. §. 5. Martyr. Sancti Ignat. and Wake's Præf. p. 119, fin.

<sup>q</sup> Polycarp. Martyr. §. 12. Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 15. p. 107, D.

<sup>r</sup> Ὅν ἅμα ταῖς Φιλίππου θυγατράσι προφητικῶ χαρίσματι λόγος ἔχει διαπρέψαι. Euseb. E. H. l. 3. c. 37, pr. In the same chapter he tells us, that the successors of the apostles, leaving their own country, travelled into foreign parts, and having laid the foundation of faith, and appointed pastors, removed still to other countries and nations, the divine favour and assistance accompanying them, Ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος εἴσεται τότε δι' αὐτῶν πλείστα παρά-δοξοι δυνάμεις ἐνέργουν, *for the Spirit of God wrought very many miracles by them.*

<sup>s</sup> P. 308, B. med.

<sup>t</sup> P. 315, B. med. Vid. et p. 247, A. fin. p. 254, B. 258, A. 302, A. et 311, B.

“ name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under  
 “ Pontius Pilate, have healed, and now do heal,  
 “ many that were possessed by demons, through the  
 “ whole world, and in your city, disappointing and  
 “ chasing away the demons which had possessed  
 “ them ; and this when they could not be healed by  
 “ any other exorcists and enchanters and sorcerers <sup>u</sup>.”  
 Theophilus of Antioch <sup>x</sup> and Tatian <sup>y</sup> speak also of  
 demoniacs as exorcised and cured by Christians in  
 their days.

Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, writes thus :  
 “ The true disciples of Jesus, receiving favour from  
 “ him, perform works for the benefit of other men,  
 “ as every one hath received the gift from him. For  
 “ some cast out demons truly and really, so that  
 “ oftentimes the persons, who were cleansed from  
 “ those evil spirits, have themselves believed, and  
 “ are in the church. Others have the knowledge  
 “ of things future, and visions and prophecies.  
 “ Others, by the laying on of their hands, heal the  
 “ sick, and restore their health. Also, as we have  
 “ before said,” (for he had spoken of this but just  
 before, c. 31. §. 2.) “ even the dead are raised, and  
 “ have continued with us many years. And indeed  
 “ the miraculous gifts are not to be numbered which  
 “ the church throughout all the world hath received

<sup>u</sup> P. 45, A.

<sup>x</sup> Ad Autol. l. 2. p. 87, C.

<sup>y</sup> Contra Græcos, p. 155, C. D. “ There are diseases and com-  
 motions of the matter which is in you. The demons ascribe  
 “ the causes of these to themselves, when they happen, entering  
 “ when the disease takes you. Sometimes also they shake the  
 “ habit of the body by a storm of their own madness : who, being  
 “ rebuked by the word of God’s power, depart affrighted, and the  
 “ diseased person is cured.”



“ of God, and daily exerciseth for the benefit of the  
 “ nations, in the name of Jesus Christ, who was cru-  
 “ cified under Pontius Pilate, neither deceiving any,  
 “ nor taking money of any <sup>z</sup>.” And in another place  
 he says, “ We have heard many brethren in the  
 “ church, who had the gift of prophecy, and spake  
 “ all manner of languages by the Spirit, and revealed  
 “ the secrets of men for public good, and expounded  
 “ the mysteries of God <sup>a</sup>.”

Tertullian frequently speaks of the power that the  
 Christians in his time had over the demons, and of  
 their dispossessing persons who were tormented and  
 distempered by them. In a treatise of his concern-  
 ing the public sports and recreations of that time,  
 written with an intention to prevent the Christians  
 from attending them, he says, “ What greater plea-  
 “ sure than that thou treadest under foot the gods  
 “ of the nations, that thou castest out demons, that  
 “ thou dost cures, that thou obtainest revelations,  
 “ that thou livest to God <sup>b</sup> ?” In his book directed  
 to Scapula the Roman governor, he says, “ We not  
 “ only reject demons, but we convict them <sup>c</sup>, and  
 “ bring them daily to open shame, and expel them  
 “ out of men, as is known to very many <sup>d</sup>.” In the  
 same book he tells the governor, that the notary of  
 a certain advocate, that the near kinsman and young  
 son of two other advocates were relieved from the  
 possession of demons by Christians. He then adds,  
 “ And how many men of note and rank (for we

<sup>z</sup> L. 2. c. 32. §. 4.

<sup>a</sup> L. 5. c. 6. §. 1.

<sup>b</sup> De Spectac. c. 29.

<sup>c</sup> That is, by making them confess themselves demons, and not  
 deities. Vid. Apol. c. 23, D.

<sup>d</sup> C. 2. p. 69, C.

“ speak not of the vulgar) have been delivered from  
 “ demons, or cured of diseases ! Even Severus himself,  
 “ the father of Antoninus, was mindful of the Chris-  
 “ tians; for he diligently sought out Proculus, a  
 “ Christian, who was surnamed Torpazion, who had  
 “ formerly cured him by anointing him with oil.  
 “ And he had him in his palace to the day of his  
 “ death, whom Antoninus also very well knew<sup>e</sup>.”  
 The Severus and Antoninus here spoken of were  
 L. Septimius Severus and Antoninus Caracalla his  
 son, two Roman emperors in Tertullian’s time. In  
 the Apology which he makes to the Roman powers,  
 he calls upon the magistrates to make trial of the  
 power which the Christians had over the heathen  
 deities: “ Let any one, who is known to be pos-  
 “ sessed by a demon, be brought into your courts of  
 “ judicature, that spirit, being commanded by any  
 “ Christian to speak, shall as truly confess himself a  
 “ demon, as he elsewhere falsely professed himself  
 “ a god. Let there be also one of those produced  
 “ who are thought to be inspired by some deity,  
 “ who, breathing upon the altars, receive the deity  
 “ from the smell of the sacrifices, who with ructa-  
 “ tion attempt, and with panting predict; that very  
 “ heavenly virgin herself, who promises rain; that  
 “ very Æsculapius the inventor of medicines; unless  
 “ they confess themselves demons, not daring to lie  
 “ to a Christian, spill ye there the blood of that  
 “ most insolent Christian<sup>f</sup>.”

<sup>e</sup> C. 4. p. 71, A.

<sup>f</sup> C. 23. p. 22, D. Vid. et p. 23, C. et c. 27, prop. fin. et c. 37, prop. fin. et c. 43. et c. 46. p. 35, C. de Spectac. c. 26. de Idololat. c. 11, prop. fin. de Coron. Mil. c. 11. p. 117, C. de Anima, c. 1. p. 264, C. et c. 57. p. 305, fin.

Origen, in his book against Celsus, speaking of the arguments for the Christian religion, mentions prophecies and miracles. The last, he says, "are proved to have been performed, as from many other things, so from that the footsteps of them still remain among those who live according to the will of Christ<sup>g</sup>." In another place, Celsus having objected to the descent of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove, Origen answers, "that a proof of the truth of this were the miracles done by our Saviour, and those which were done after by his apostles. For without wonders and miracles they could not have persuaded their hearers to leave the religious customs they were educated in, and receive with hazard, even that of their lives, new doctrines and new systems. Moreover the footsteps of that Holy Spirit, which was seen in the form of a dove, are yet preserved among Christians. They cast out demons, and perform many cures, and have visions of things future, according to the will of Christ<sup>h</sup>." In another part of the same work he says, "It is evident, that since the coming of Christ the Jews are entirely forsaken, and have none of those things which were anciently esteemed by them venerable, nor have they any proof that the Deity is among them. For there are no more any prophets nor any miracles among them: of which there are large footsteps found among Christians. And if we, who say it, may be believed, we have ourselves seen them<sup>i</sup>." Again he says, "We can shew an unspeakable number of Greeks and Barbarians who believe in Je-

<sup>g</sup> L. 1. p. 5, prop. fin.

<sup>h</sup> P. 34, fin.

<sup>i</sup> L. 2. p. 62. l. 16.

“sus, some of whom give proofs, that by their faith  
 “they have received a wonderful power, in those  
 “they cure; calling over those, who need healing,  
 “no other than the supreme God, and the name of  
 “Jesus, with his history. For by these things have  
 “we seen many freed from grievous diseases, and  
 “distractions of mind, and madness, and ten thou-  
 “sand other evils, which neither men nor demons  
 “have cured<sup>k</sup>.”

Octavius, a Christian, is represented in Minucius Felix as saying to Cæcilius, a heathen, “All these  
 “things the most of you know, that the demons  
 “themselves confess of themselves, as often as they  
 “are by us driven out of the bodies they possess, by  
 “the torture of words, and the burning of prayer;  
 “Saturn himself, and Serapis, and Jupiter, and all  
 “the demons you worship, being overcome with  
 “pain, speak out what they are. Nor is it to be  
 “thought they lie, to their own disgrace, especially  
 “when some of you are standing by. Believe their  
 “own testimony, that they are demons: believe  
 “them confessing the truth of themselves. For,  
 “being adjured by the true and only God, they un-  
 “willingly continue<sup>l</sup> in the miserable bodies they  
 “possess, and either immediately depart, or leave  
 “them by degrees, according as the faith of the

<sup>k</sup> L. 3. p. 124, paulo post med. Vid. et l. 1. p. 7, paulo post initium; et p. 20. l. 13. et p. 53. l. 11. et l. 2. p. 80. l. 40. et l. 3. p. 127. l. 25. et l. 7. p. 334. l. 18. et p. 337. l. 27. et p. 376, prop. fin. et l. 8. p. 417, pr.

<sup>l</sup> Some copies here have *inhorrescunt* instead of *inhærescunt*, and *miseri* for *miseris*: “They miserably shake for fear, against their  
 “wills, in the bodies they possess.”

“ sufferer assists, or the miraculous power of the  
 “ person who cures enforces<sup>m</sup>.”

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who suffered martyrdom in the year of Christ 258, makes use of the very words of Minucius Felix, who also was an African orator, and probably flourished not many years before Cyprian. In one of his treatises Cyprian, speaking of demons, has these words: “ These, “ being adjured by us, immediately yield, and confess, and are compelled to go out of the bodies “ they possess. You may see them, through our “ words, and the operation of a hidden power, beaten “ with scourges, roasted with fire, racked by the addition of an increasing punishment, howl, groan, “ deprecate, confess whence they came, and when “ they depart, even those who worship them standing by, and hearing them. And they either go “ out of the bodies they possess immediately, or forsake them by degrees, as the faith of the patient “ assists, or the miraculous power of him that cures “ enforces<sup>n</sup>.” In his Epistle to Magnes he says, “ Even at this day the Devil is scourged and burnt “ and racked by our exorcists by means of human “ words and the divine power<sup>o</sup>.” In another piece of his, written to Demetrian, a heathen judge,

<sup>m</sup> P. 89. ed. Oxon. 1631. Lugd. Bat. 1672. p. 252, &c. In this and the like following passages is a plain allusion to the methods of bringing persons to confession by the question or torture. The three usual instruments of torture were the wheel, the fire, and the scourge. *Prohinc tormentis veritas eruenda.*—*Nec mora, cum ritu Græciensi ignis et rota, tum omne flagrorum genus inferuntur.* *Apul. Metamorph.* l. 3. p. 48, fin. Vid. Pricæi Not.

<sup>n</sup> De Idol. Van. p. 14.

<sup>o</sup> P. 187, fin.

greatly imbibtered against the Christians, he says, “ O that you would hear and see them when they are “ adjured by us, and tortured with spiritual scourges, “ and by the torment of words cast out of the bodies “ they possess, when howling and groaning, through “ human words and the divine power, feeling scourges “ and stripes, they confess a judgment to come. Come “ and know that the things which we speak are “ true.” And a little after, “ You shall see stand “ bound, trembling, and captive, under our hands, “ those whom you admire and adore as gods <sup>P.</sup>”

Arnobius, who flourished soon after Cyprian, in the decline of the third century, in his dispute against the heathens, addresses them thus: “ Was “ he a mortal, or one of us, whose name being heard “ chases away the evil spirits, imposes silence on the “ heathen prophets, renders the soothsayers uncon- “ sulted, frustrates the performances of the proud “ magicians, not, as ye say, with the horror of his “ name, but by a superior power <sup>Q?</sup>”

Lactantius, who was scholar of Arnobius, speaking of the demons, says, “ They fear the righteous, “ that is, the worshippers of God, by whose name “ being adjured they depart out of the bodies they “ possess. Being scourged by the words of the “ righteous, as with whips, they confess not only “ that they are demons, but also declare their names, “ those names which in the temples are adored: “ which thing they most frequently do before their “ worshippers, not so much to the disgrace of reli- “ gion, as of their own honour, because they are not “ able to lie either to God, by whom they are ad-

<sup>P</sup> P. 191. Vid. ad Donat. p. 4.

<sup>Q</sup> L. I. p. 27, med.



“ jured, or to the righteous, by whose words they  
 “ are tortured. Therefore oftentimes with the most  
 “ dismal howlings they cry out that they are scourg-  
 “ ed and burnt, and will immediately depart<sup>r</sup>.” In  
 another place, speaking of these evil spirits, as insi-  
 nuating themselves into the heathen, and stirring  
 them up to persecute the Christians, he adds, “When  
 “ they possess the bodies of men, and vex their  
 “ souls, being adjured by the righteous, they are  
 “ chased away by the name of the true God; which  
 “ being heard, they tremble, cry out, and declare  
 “ that they are burnt and scourged; and being in-  
 “ terrogated, confess who they are, when they came,  
 “ and how they stole into the man. Thus racked  
 “ and tortured are they banished by virtue of the  
 “ divine name<sup>s</sup>.”

These are some of the proofs we have of the mi-  
 raculous works which were performed in the first  
 ages of Christianity by the effusion of the Holy  
 Ghost. Such who became Christians after the times  
 of the apostles, and had not been present at the  
 great things done by them, besides the many un-  
 doubted testimonies they received of the truth of  
 these facts, had also the satisfaction of seeing large  
 remainders of the same power continued in the  
 church. This was so convincing an evidence of the  
 truth of what is related concerning the miraculous  
 gifts conferred by Christ in the Gospels and Acts  
 and Epistles, as could leave no room for hesitation.  
 Christ had not only exercised this amazing power

<sup>r</sup> L. 2. de Orig. Error. c. 15. p. 253, fin.

<sup>s</sup> L. 5. p. 622. Vid. et Euseb. Demonst. l. 3. p. 132, D. et  
 133, a. et contra Hieroclem, p. 514, pr. Firmicum de Error. Prof.  
 Relig. p. 29, fin. et p. 30. et p. 61, paulo post med.

himself, and communicated it to his immediate disciples, but had promised that those also who should believe on him through their preaching should be enriched herewith. When persons were eyewitnesses that this promise was fulfilled, could they have a more clear proof of the truth of Christ's prophetic character? Could they at all doubt of the fulness of that power in Christ, of which they saw so many instances like rivulets streaming from him? Such a faith, which removed all doubting, the Christians at that time needed, to support them under the calumnies, reproaches, and persecutions raised against them; under the infamy, losses, imprisonments, tortures, and deaths they suffered. All the world was against them: far the greatest part not a little enraged at them: and if the great facts related in the Gospels were not true, they had no foundation for hope, they were wholly without comfort.

It pleased God therefore to continue sensible proofs of the truth of Christianity till the earthly powers were changed, the Roman emperors became Christians, and there was not so unequal a weight pressing against the profession of the religion he had revealed. The authors I have quoted to prove this are such against whose testimony no reasonable objection can lie: they have all the marks of sincerity and integrity. Nor could they conspire together to deceive us herein, because they lived at different times, and in distant countries; some in Europe, some in Asia, some in Africa: some at the latter end of the first century and beginning of the second, some in the middle of the second, some at the close of the second and commencement of the

third, some in the middle, and others at the decline of the third century.

These things are said by them, not among themselves only, but to their professed, avowed enemies; not in their private writings only, but in their public Apologies. These things are asserted by them before the Roman magistrates, not only the inferior judges and governors of provinces, but the emperors themselves, and the Roman senate. They not only speak of these things as what they had seen done themselves, but they tell their enemies that they had been very frequently performed also in their presence. They proceed yet further, and desire that an experiment may be made, call aloud for an open trial, and offer willingly to die, if this miraculous power be not manifestly shewn.

These were men not only of eminence in the church, but had been so, many of them, among the heathen; had been philosophers, lawyers, orators, or pleaders, and distinguished as such; were wonderfully skilled in all the heathen learning; understood in the greatest perfection the heathen theogony and mythology, as well as philosophy. Few of them were educated Christians. Far the most of them became such in their riper years: and in their writings, directed to the heathens, acknowledge that they were formerly under all the same prejudices which now possess them, and believed all the same infamous reports spread concerning the Christians which they are now apt to object as so many arguments against the truth of this religion. These are the men whose testimonies I have alleged. And since we have the concurring testimony of such

writers for three centuries together, can there be a greater confirmation of the principal facts related in the Acts of the Apostles?

It may possibly be asked, But what do the enemies of Christianity say to these things? Are there none but Christians that take notice of these wonderful events? It is much, if there were such amazing things performed, that they should not be recorded either by Jews or heathens. To this I answer, That the enemies of Christianity also plainly concur in confirming these facts. It is related in the Gospels, that the Pharisees said of our Saviour, *He casteth out devils by Beelzebub the prince of devils*<sup>t</sup>: the meaning of which is, that he had by a superior skill in art magic obtained the assistance of the most powerful of demons. The successors of the Pharisees say the same thing in the Talmud<sup>u</sup>. Even Celsus the Epicurean, when he introduces a Jew discoursing against Christ, says of him, “that through poverty being obliged to serve “for hire in Egypt, he learnt certain powers on “which the Egyptians pride themselves, (meaning “the magic art,) and returned entertaining great “sentiments of himself by reason of these powers, “and because of them proclaimed himself a god<sup>x</sup>.” This is a fair acknowledgment of the great facts done by our Lord, though it is imputing them to a wrong principle. The heathen philosophers were divided in their opinions concerning the reality of

<sup>t</sup> Matt. ix. 14. and xii. 24. Mark iii. 22. Luke xi. 15.

<sup>u</sup> Quoted by Huet. Dem. p. 30. §. 6. Vid. et p. 497. §. 1. Bab. Schab, f. 104. 2. Sanhed, f. 107. 2. quoted by Light. vol. 2. p. 189.

<sup>x</sup> Orig. adv. Cels. l. 1. p. 22, prop. fin. Vid. et p. 34, prop. fin.

magic. The Epicureans derided it. The Pythagoreans were fond of it. Celsus, though a professed Epicurean, and though he had wrote several books against magic<sup>y</sup>, yet is so inconsistent with himself, that even in his own person he imputes the miracles of Christ and his followers to this art<sup>z</sup>. He says in one place, "The Christians seem to prevail by the "names and enchantments of certain demons<sup>a</sup>:" which is a clear evidence that the Christians of his time had the reputation of doing some great and wonderful works.

Porphyry ascribes the miracles of Christ and his followers to the same<sup>b</sup>. Hierocles, another bitter writer against the Christians, does the same<sup>c</sup>. Julian the Apostate says of Jesus, "That he did nothing "worthy of fame while he lived, unless one supposes the curing the lame and the blind, and exorcising demons in the towns of Bethsaida and "Bethany, to be the greatest of works<sup>d</sup>." The proof of these facts was too strong to be withstood, otherwise we should not have had so candid an acknowledgment of their truth from so bitter an enemy. He says of the apostle Paul, "that he was "the greatest of all the deceivers and wizards that

<sup>y</sup> Vid. Orig. adv. Cels. p. 8. 32. 53. et 407.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. l. 1. p. 7. l. 21.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. l. 1. p. 7. l. 5.

<sup>b</sup> Hieron. Op. t. 2. p. 160. cit. a. Basnag. Ann. vol. 2. p. 439.

<sup>c</sup> Euseb. contra Hieroc. p. 512, B. D. And that this was the usual account given of our Lord's miracles by the heathen, we learn from Arnobius, l. 1. p. 25, prop. init. Occursurus forsitan rursus est *cum aliis multis*, calumniosis illis et puerilibus vocibus: Magus fuit, clandestinis artibus omnia illa perfecit. Ægyptiorum ex adytis angelorum potentium nomina, et remotas furatus est disciplinas.

<sup>d</sup> Cyril. Alex. contr. Jul. l. 6. p. 191, E.

“ ever were at any time in any place<sup>e</sup> :” and asserts of all the apostles in general, “ that after their Master’s death they practised the magic art, and taught it to their first converts<sup>f</sup>.”

Another method taken by the enemies of Christianity in the first ages was to set up some great and eminent magician in opposition to Christ, and to attempt to shew that their works equalled, or even exceeded, those of Christ. Thus, in particular, they compare Apollonius Tyanæus and Apuleius with Christ<sup>g</sup>. Philostratus the Athenian took not a little pains in writing the Life of Apollonius; but notwithstanding all his art and learning, it is obvious to every one who reads it, that he had the life of Christ before him, and that he makes Apollonius but awkwardly mimic the miracles of Jesus. However, this is another certain evidence that the greatest men among the heathen philosophers, who opposed Christianity, could not get over the notoriety of facts on which it was founded. The making such comparisons is a clear proof that they could not

<sup>e</sup> L. 3. p. 100, A.

<sup>f</sup> L. 10. p. 340, pr. It was doubtless with a view to this accusation that the Christian religion is called by Suetonius *superstitio malefica*, Ner. c. 16. n. 3. Vid. Pitisci Notas, n. 15. And by Tacitus, *exitiabilis superstitio*. The magic arts were esteemed mischievous, destructive, poisonous. And these are the *flagitia* mentioned by him in the same place, Ann. l. 15. c. 44.

<sup>g</sup> Lactant. l. 5. c. 3. p. 540, fin. Marcellinus Augustino epist. 4. cit. ibi in Not. Euseb. contra Hieroc. Vid. et Arnob. l. 1. p. 31. Philostratus and Hierocles deny that Apollonius was a magician or impostor; but that he was esteemed such is fully evident from Lucian’s Alexander or Pseudomantis, who makes Alexander to be the scholar of one of the followers of Apollonius, p. 862.



deny but that our Saviour had performed many great and wonderful works.

I may add yet further, that had there come down to us any Jewish or heathen books, in which the miracles of Christ and his apostles had been recorded in a plain and simple manner, without any malicious turn and invidious reflection accompanying the narration, they would have been esteemed of no worth, and cried out upon as Christian forgeries. This is the case with regard to a known passage in Josephus, who describes Jesus as a performer of wonderful works. The objection is, How the writer could remain a Jew, after having given Jesus the character of being the Christ foretold by the prophets? as if it were necessary that the principles and practices of persons should always agree. Is it then so uncommon a thing for men to act against the conviction of their own minds? We are informed by several of the ancient Christian writers, that Phlegon, the freedman of the emperor Adrian, recorded the darkness which happened at our Saviour's crucifixion. The truth of this has been warmly disputed by some modern critics, and as fully defended by others. Origen in his book against Celsus says, that the same Phlegon, in the thirteenth or fourteenth book of his Chronicles, "ascribes the fore-  
" knowledge of certain future events to Christ, con-  
" founding the master with his apostle, putting the  
" name of Peter instead of that of Jesus, and testi-  
" fies that the events answered the prediction <sup>h</sup>."

Thus have I shewn how far the several things

<sup>h</sup> L. 2. p. 69.

related in the Acts of the Apostles are confirmed by other authors. And upon the whole I may venture to affirm, that there is no History extant in the world, the several circumstances, incidental facts, and principal matters whereof are so strongly confirmed by a variety of other authors as this is.

## CHAP. XIV.

*That the History of the Acts was written by  
St. Luke.*

I PROCEED now to the third general head proposed, which is, to lay before you the plain and direct proofs there are that the History of the Acts was written by St. Luke, and was owned and received by the Christians in the first ages as a sacred book, and the arguments thence arising for the truth of the facts therein related.

That the Gospel which is ascribed to St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles were written by one and the same author, is evident from the manner in which they begin. They are both directed to Theophilus, and the latter makes express mention of the former as written by the same author and to the same person.

All the manuscript copies of the Gospel ascribed to St. Luke have his name prefixed to them, not only the more modern ones, but the most ancient. Even the copies extant in Tertullian's time had it so. It is not indeed probable that the evangelists put their own names to them, at least it does not seem credible that they should have done it in that uniform manner in which they now appear. There can be no doubt, however, but that they were prefixed by those who first copied them, and well knew the writers. When there was more than one Gospel published, it was necessary that the names should be set to them, in order to distinguish one from the other.

Tertullian, who wrote his book against Marcion the heretic in the year of Christ 208<sup>a</sup>, says, that the Gospel which Marcion used was not to be owned, because it had no title, and was ascribed to no author. This heretic received no other Gospel than that of St. Luke, and even that he curtailed and corrupted as he thought fit, in order to make it agree, as well as he could, with the romantic doctrines he taught; but he prefixed no name to it. Tertullian argues that it ought not to be acknowledged, not having the name of the author before it<sup>b</sup>. This is a plain evidence that all the Gospels which were owned and received by the catholic church at that time had the names of the authors prefixed to them; and particularly that the copies of St. Luke's Gospel had his name placed before them, at least all which Tertullian had seen; and it is very probable he might have seen copies which were above a hundred years old, that is, some of the first copies that were transcribed after the Gospel was published. We that have manuscript copies now extant six or eight hundred years old, cannot think it strange that there should be copies of St. Luke's Gospel of a hundred and ten, or a hundred and twenty years, preserved at that time, if not in the churches of Africa, at least in the church of Rome, which was a place frequently visited by Tertullian<sup>c</sup>. There are several manuscript copies of the Acts also, which have St.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Tertulliani Vitam per Pamelium, ad an. 208.

<sup>b</sup> Non agnoscendum opus, quod non erigat frontem, quod nullam fidem reponittat de plenitudine tituli et professione debita auctoris, l. 4. p. 414, C.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Tertull. Vit. per Pamel. ad an. 205, fin. 206, fin. 209, pr. 210, pr.

Luke's name prefixed to them<sup>d</sup>. And the reason why his name is not universally set before this book is, because it is evident from the work itself that it belongs to the same author which wrote the Gospel, and that both the Gospel and the Acts are esteemed as two parts of one and the same work<sup>e</sup>.

Whoever was the author, it is certain from the style that he was the companion of the apostle Paul in his travels, and particularly, that he sailed with him from Judæa to Rome, when St. Paul was sent thither by Festus the Roman governor, upon his appeal to Cæsar. And it is fully evident from the salutations sent from Rome by St. Paul in his Epistles to the Colossians, and to Philemon, when he was the first time a prisoner there, that St. Luke was with him. In the one he calls him *the beloved physician*<sup>f</sup>, in the other his *fellow-labourer*<sup>g</sup>.

The ancient fathers, that had the certain means of knowing who was the author of the History of the Acts, unanimously ascribe it to St. Luke. Thus does Irenæus<sup>h</sup>, Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>i</sup>, Tertullian<sup>k</sup>, Origen<sup>l</sup>, Eusebius<sup>m</sup>, and those who came after. And indeed I know not that any one person ever enter-

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Sim. Crit. Hist. de N. T. c. 14. p. 152.

<sup>e</sup> Iren. l. 3. c. 15, pr. Grabe's Spicil. vol. 1. p. 34, pr.

<sup>f</sup> Col. iv. 14.

<sup>g</sup> Philem. 24.

<sup>h</sup> L. 1. c. 23. §. 1. l. 3. c. 14, throughout; l. 4. c. 15. §. 1.

<sup>i</sup> Strom. l. 5. c. 12, fin. p. 696. and Hypotyp. quoted by Euseb.

E. H. l. 6. c. 14, pr.

<sup>k</sup> De Jej. c. 10. p. 549, B. Cum in eodem commentario Lucæ et tertia hora orationis demonstratur.

<sup>l</sup> Adv. Cels. l. 6. p. 282, fin. vol. 1. in Matt. p. 382, D. vol. 2. in Joan. p. 23, D. Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 25, fin.

<sup>m</sup> E. H. l. 3. c. 4, pr. et med. c. 31, D. l. 2. c. 11, pr. et c. 22, B. D.

tained a doubt, or made the least hesitation concerning the author of the Acts. It is true, there were heretics who rejected it<sup>n</sup>: but they did not reject it because they were in any suspense about the author; they well knew it was wrote by St. Luke, and at the same time made use of no other Gospel than his, though they both took from and added to it as they pleased<sup>o</sup>. These were men that pretended to a more exalted degree of knowledge than most of the apostles were endued with<sup>p</sup>, and therefore might very consistently reject the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, though they knew and acknowledged the authors to be apostles.

I shall give you a brief character of the fathers I have mentioned, and shew you how they had the certain means of knowing who was the author of the History of the Acts. Irenæus was a man of great prudence, learning, and piety, much esteemed both by those of his own time, and those which fol-

<sup>n</sup> Cerdo, Marcion, and their followers, and the Severians, a sect of the Encratites, who were also originally from Marcion. Vid. Tertull. de Præscript. Hær. c. 51. p. 222, fin. Adv. Marcion. p. 463, A. Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 29. p. 121, fin. et 122, B.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Iren. l. 1. c. 27. §. 2. et l. 3. c. 12. §. 12. et c. 14. 4. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l. 1. c. 1. et l. 4. c. 2—5. De Carne Christi c. 3. p. 309, B.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Iren. l. 1. c. 27. §. 2. et l. 3. c. 12. §. 12. Putaverunt semetipsos plus invenisse quam apostoli—Et apostolos quidem adhuc quæ sunt Judæorum sentientes, annuntiâsse evangelium, se autem sinceriores et prudentiores apostolis esse. Unde et Marcion, et qui ab eo sunt, ad intercidendas conversi sunt scripturas, quasdam quidem in totum non cognoscentes, secundum Lucam autem Evangelium, et Epistolas Pauli decurtantes, hæc sola legitima esse dicunt, quæ ipsi minoraverunt. Et Tertull. de Præscript. c. 22.



lowed. He gives us this account of the four Gospels: "Matthew published his Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language at the time that Peter and Paul preached at Rome, and founded a church there. After their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things which were preached by Peter. And Luke the follower of Paul wrote in a book the Gospel preached by him. Afterwards, John, the disciple of the Lord, who leaned upon his breast, published also a Gospel, while he lived at Ephesus in Asia<sup>q</sup>." A few pages after this, having observed that Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, and Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, agree in the narration of the same fact<sup>r</sup>, he adds, "that this Luke was inseparable from Paul, and his fellow-labourer in the Gospel, he himself shews, not boasting, but compelled by the truth<sup>s</sup>." He then relates from the Acts of the Apostles a brief account of Luke's travels with St. Paul, and concludes thus: "But if Luke, who always preached with Paul, and is called *beloved* by him, and performed the office of an evangelist with him, and was intrusted to relate to us the Gospel, learnt nothing else from him, as we have proved from his words; how comes it to pass that these men, who never were in Paul's company, or joined to him by any degree of friendship, boast that they have learnt hidden and ineffable mysteries<sup>t</sup>?" A little after, he says, "But if any reject Luke, as not knowing the truth, he will be convicted of rejecting the Gospel, of

<sup>q</sup> L. 3. c. 1. §. 1.

<sup>r</sup> L. 3. c. 13, fin.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. c. 14, pr.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. §. 1, fin.

“ which he vouchsafes to be a disciple <sup>u</sup> ;” because the heretics he is here speaking of received no other Gospel than that of St. Luke. He proceeds in the next words to shew, that Luke relates many particulars which are not found in the other Gospels ; which particulars were owned and received by the heretics he is speaking of. He then adds, “ It is necessary that they receive also the other things said by him, or reject these. For it will not be permitted them by persons of sense to receive some of those things which are related by Luke as though they were true, and to reject others as though he knew not the truth <sup>x</sup> .” This he says, because the Marcionites cut off some things from Luke’s Gospel, and rejected the Acts of the Apostles. A little after, he goes on thus : “ We say the same thing also to those who acknowledge not the apostle Paul, that either they ought to reject, or not make use of, the other particulars of the Gospel, which are come to our knowledge by Luke only ; or if they receive all those particulars, it is necessary they receive also that testimony of his concerning Paul.” And then quotes two passages from the Acts of the Apostles relating to St. Paul <sup>y</sup> . And a few lines after, proceeds thus : “ Perhaps for this reason God has caused that very many particulars of the Gospel history, which all are obliged to use, should be related by Luke, that all, receiving the subsequent narration which he gives of the acts and doctrine of the apostles, and so having the rule of faith uncorrupted, might be saved.”

Irenæus, speaking of the revelation made by St.

<sup>u</sup> L. 3. c. 14. §. 3, pr.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. §. 4, pr.

<sup>y</sup> C. 15. §. 1.

John, says, "It was seen not long ago, and almost  
 "in our own age, at the end of the reign of Domi-  
 "tian<sup>z</sup>:" and more than once informs us, that the  
 apostle John lived to the times of the emperor Tra-  
 jan<sup>a</sup>. And in agreement herewith, Clemens Alexan-  
 drinus has given us a brief account of this apostle's  
 conduct at Ephesus, and the neighbouring coun-  
 tries, after his return from the isle of Patmos, in the  
 reigns of Nerva and Trajan<sup>b</sup>. Irenæus also tells us  
 that Polycarp was ordained bishop of Smyrna by the  
 apostles<sup>c</sup>: and in his letter to Victor bishop of Rome  
 says, that Polycarp had lived familiarly, not only  
 with the apostle John, but with others also of the  
 apostles<sup>d</sup>. Eusebius expressly tells us, that before  
 John wrote his Gospel, the other three Gospels were  
 in the hands of all, and that the apostle John con-  
 firmed the truth of them by his testimony<sup>e</sup>. Had  
 not Polycarp then the means of knowing exactly  
 who was the author of each of the four Gospels and  
 of the History of the Acts? Must he not have been  
 fully informed of these facts by the apostle John,  
 and those other apostles with whom he conversed?  
 Irenæus was in his younger days acquainted with  
 Polycarp<sup>f</sup>; and though very young at that time,  
 yet says, "he had a more perfect remembrance of  
 "the things which then happened, than of things  
 "which fell out much later; so that he could give  
 "an account of Polycarp's manner of life, and the  
 "discourses which he made to the people, and how

<sup>z</sup> L. 5. c. 30. §. 3, fin.

<sup>a</sup> L. 2. c. 22. §. 5. et l. 3. c. 3. §. 4, fin.

<sup>b</sup> Quis Dives Salvetur? p. 959, pr.

<sup>d</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 5. c. 24. p. 157, B.

<sup>e</sup> E. H. l. 3. c. 24. p. 76, C.

<sup>c</sup> L. 3. c. 3. §. 4, pr.

<sup>f</sup> L. 3. c. 3. §. 4, pr.

“ he related the conversation which he had had with  
 “ John and others, who had seen our Lord, and how  
 “ he mentioned their sayings<sup>g</sup>.” Can it be imagined  
 that among the things which Irenæus learnt from  
 this great man, he received not information from  
 him concerning the authors of the four Gospels and  
 the History of the Acts?

St. Jerom tells us, that after Polycarp's death Irenæus was under the instruction of Papias bishop of Hierapolis<sup>h</sup>. This Papias wrote five books, some remains of which are still preserved in Eusebius, wherein he tells us, “ That he diligently inquired  
 “ after the sayings of the apostles, and other disci-  
 “ ples of our Lord, what Andrew, what Peter, what  
 “ Philip, what Thomas, what James, what John,  
 “ what Matthew and the other disciples of our Lord  
 “ said<sup>i</sup>.” He had been a hearer of Aristion and John the presbyter, two of our Lord's disciples<sup>k</sup>. Irenæus himself mentions these books of Papias, and adds, moreover, that he was Polycarp's friend<sup>l</sup>. Might not Irenæus learn from this bishop who were the authors of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles? That Papias had received information concerning the Gospels is sufficiently plain from a little fragment of his preserved by Eusebius, containing a relation of what John the presbyter said of the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Mark<sup>m</sup>.

<sup>g</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 5. c. 20. p. 152, fin.

<sup>h</sup> In Catalog. et ep. 55. al. 29. ad Theod.

<sup>i</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 3. c. 39. p. 89.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. p. 90, pr.

<sup>l</sup> L. 5. c. 33. n. 4.

<sup>m</sup> E. H. l. 3. c. 39. p. 90, fin. et 91. The title of Papias's books was, An Exposition of the Oracles of our Lord.

Irenæus not only mentions Polycarp and Papias by name, but speaks frequently of elders or aged men, who had seen both John and others of the apostles, as persons who had given him information<sup>n</sup>. But, had he been acquainted with no other than Pothinus bishop of Lyons, how easy was it for him to have obtained a certain account of the authors of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles? Pothinus suffered martyrdom at Lyons in the year of Christ 177<sup>o</sup>, when he was above ninety years of age<sup>p</sup>. He was more than thirteen years old therefore when the apostle John died. Might not he easily learn from many, who had conversed with John and several other apostles, who were the authors of the four Gospels and the Acts? Irenæus was a presbyter of the church of Lyons under this bishop, and succeeded him in the bishopric<sup>q</sup>. If therefore he had not received a full account of this matter before, which, I think, no reasonable man can doubt but he must have done, most certainly he could not fail of having it from him.

But supposing we had been wholly ignorant of the great advantages which Irenæus had from his acquaintance with Polycarp, Papias, and Pothinus, and the other ancient men mentioned by him; we might easily conceive that at the time he lived there could be no difficulty in learning who were the au-

<sup>n</sup> L. 2. c. 22. §. 5. l. 4. c. 27. §. 1. c. 30. §. 1. c. 31. §. 1. et 32. §. 1. l. 5. c. 5. §. 1. c. 17. §. 4. fin. c. 33. §. 3. et 36. §. 1, 2.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Dodwell, Dissert. in Iren. 4. §. 3. p. 294. Fabr. Biblioth. in Iren. Massuet. Vit. Iren. p. 80.

<sup>p</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 5. c. 1. p. 129, D.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. c. 4, pr. et c. 5. p. 138, B. et Hieron. in Catal.

thors of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Although there is a great variety of opinions among learned men concerning the time when Irenæus was born, they are generally agreed that he was made bishop of Lyons in the room of Pothinus, about the year of Christ 177 or 178. The learned Dodwell places it ten years sooner, in the year 168. The question is, What was his age at this time? Massuet the learned Benedictine, who gave us the last edition of Irenæus's works, fixes his birth much later than any other writer I have met with. He places it as low as the year of Christ 140, which is very hardly to be reconciled with the account Irenæus gives us of himself. The most place it at least twenty years sooner. However, we will at present take it for granted that Massuet's calculation is right, and that he was but thirty-seven or thirty-eight years of age when ordained bishop of Lyons; and though from his earliest years instructed in the principles of Christianity, yet we will also suppose that he began not his inquiry concerning the authors of these books till he was twenty years of age.

Was it not an easy thing in the year of Christ 160 to learn in the several churches of Christians dispersed through the world how they came in possession of these books, of whom they received them, and upon what authority? more especially in the churches founded by the apostles themselves. Had he at this time made inquiry in the church of Ephesus, (and Ephesus was not far from Smyrna, where he had received some of his first instructions,) was there no person then living of eighty or upwards, who had been a Christian, and lived in that city from his youth? If there was, that person must



have been twenty years of age at least when the apostle John died, and probably must have been known to him. For the apostle spent the last part of his time in that city. But persons of sixty, or fifty, nay of forty years of age, in that city, must have known many, very many, that had been long acquainted with the apostle John. And persons of seventy, or even of sixty, must have known those that remembered the apostle Paul himself, who founded this church. For the year of Christ 56, and a great part of 57, St. Paul spent at Ephesus. Could it then be any difficulty for Irenæus to inform himself by what authority they received the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, and who wrote them? Or, had he at this time made inquiry in the church of Rome, persons of sixty, or even of fifty years of age, must have been acquainted with very many who inhabited that great city when the apostles Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom there, which was in the year of Christ 68.

I the rather insist upon this, because it is an argument made use of by Irenæus himself to prove the truth and genuineness of the books received by the church against the heretics. He says in one place, "If there should a dispute arise upon any little matter, ought not recourse to be had to the most ancient churches in which the apostles themselves were conversant? And ought we not to learn from them what is clear and certain upon the question moved?"<sup>r</sup> Intimating, that much more ought it to be done in matters of great moment. Can we then think that if Irenæus had had any the

<sup>r</sup> L. 3. c. 4. §. 1, prop. fin.

least scruple upon his mind concerning the authors or authority of the four gospels, he would not have taken this method to be satisfied? For could there be a question of greater moment in his sense of things, who expressly says, "they were written that they might be the foundation and pillar of our faith?" In another place he asserts, "that the churches founded by the apostles had preserved the scriptures entire without falsifying or corrupting them," meaning among the rest the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. For he not only quotes each of these, and that frequently, as scripture; but this is spoken in direct opposition to those heretics, who, as he before tells us, rejected some of these books, and corrupted the other<sup>u</sup>. From what has been said, it appears beyond all contradiction, that Irenæus had the certain means of knowing who were the authors of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.

The next person I mentioned as ascribing the Acts of the Apostles to St. Luke, is Clemens Alexandrinus, who had been educated in the heathen religion and learning<sup>x</sup>. And perhaps no man ever had a more extensive knowledge in both. When Pantænus went to preach the gospel to the Indians, Clemens was made master of the catechetical school at Alexandria in his room<sup>y</sup>, as it is thought, about

<sup>s</sup> L. 3. c. 1, pr.

<sup>t</sup> L. 4. c. 33. §. 8.

<sup>u</sup> L. 1. c. 27. §. 2. et l. 3. c. 11. §. 7. 9. et c. 12. §. 12.

<sup>x</sup> Euseb. Præp. Evan. l. 2. c. 2, fin. p. 61.

<sup>y</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 5. c. 10. et l. 6. c. 6. Eusebius supposes him to have succeeded after the death of Pantænus; but this could not well be, because Origen was acquainted with Pantænus. Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 14. p. 176, pr. Vid. Tillemont. Fabric. et Dodwell.

the year of Christ 189<sup>z</sup>. He wrote his book called *Stromateis* after the death of the emperor Commodus. For he therein computes the years from our Saviour's birth to the death of Commodus to be 194<sup>a</sup>. We have no account what his age was when he became a convert to Christianity, or when he was fixed at the head of the Alexandrian school. Eusebius represents him as saying, "that he was "next in time to those who succeeded the apostles<sup>b</sup>;" i. e. that there was one generation of men between him and those who lived and conversed with the apostles. This he tells us himself, "that "in various parts of the world he met with those "who preserved the true tradition of the blessed "doctrine, received by succession immediately from "Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, the holy "apostles, as a son receives from his father<sup>c</sup>."

If we suppose that Clemens was a Christian twenty years before he was intrusted with the school of Alexandria, which is no unreasonable supposition, it is probable he began his travels about the year of Christ 170. For that he had been in Greece, Italy, Cœlesyria, Palestine, Egypt, and met in those places with such persons as gave him satisfaction in the things he desired the knowledge of, he fully intimates to us<sup>d</sup>. And it is certain at this time persons of seventy or eighty years of age might have conversed with many who knew the apostles, not only the apostle John, but James, Peter, and Paul. Narcissus in Palestine was about this age at

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Fabric. Biblioth.

<sup>a</sup> Strom. l. 1. p. 407. Vid. et 403. et 406.

<sup>b</sup> E. II. l. 6. c. 13, fin.

<sup>c</sup> Strom. l. 1. p. 322. Euseb. E. II. l. 5. c. 11.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid.

the time we are speaking of, and lived afterwards to complete a hundred and sixteen years<sup>c</sup>. How easy was it for Clemens to have certain information who were the authors of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles from those ancient Christians which he made it his business to search for in so many different parts of the world. That they did relate to him several particulars concerning the Gospels is evident from his own words. For he gives an account from them of the order in which the four Gospels were written, and of the providential occasion of St. Mark's writing the Gospel ascribed to him, and how St. John was prevailed with and inspired to write the Gospel which goes under his name<sup>f</sup>. In the same work Clemens tells us, that the Epistle to the Hebrews is St. Paul's, written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue; but that St. Luke, carefully interpreting it, published it to the Greeks; whence it comes to pass that there is found the same appearance of style both in this Epistle and in the Acts<sup>g</sup>. This account also no doubt he received from some of his ancient acquaintance, though it be not expressly mentioned by him.

Tertullian is another person I have mentioned as ascribing the Acts of the Apostles to St. Luke. He lived at the same time with Clemens Alexandrinus; a man of a sharp wit, wonderful learning, and ad-

<sup>c</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 11. It is a remarkable providence, that notwithstanding the severe persecutions there were so many Christians preserved to an old age at the beginning of Christianity, to satisfy persons from their own knowledge of the facts, concerning which they would be naturally led to inquire.

<sup>f</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 14. C. D. <sup>g</sup> Ibid. B.

mirably skilled in the Roman laws<sup>h</sup>. He also had been a heathen, and in what year he was converted to Christianity is uncertain<sup>i</sup>. Pamelius, who took not a little pains to collect all the notices of time that are any where dropt in his works, has fixed it to the year of Christ 196<sup>k</sup>. Our learned countryman Dr. Cave has placed it eleven years sooner, in the year of Christ 185. Perhaps the truth may lie in the mean between both. That he wrote his first book against Marcion in the fifteenth year of the emperor Severus, that is, about the year of Christ 207 or 208, is sufficiently evident from his own words<sup>l</sup>. And that he had written many of his works before this, several of them before the year of Christ 200, will appear to any one who will give himself the trouble to examine<sup>m</sup>. Tertullian, though born at Carthage<sup>n</sup>, and for the most part resident there<sup>o</sup>, yet no doubt was sometimes at Rome. There was so great a commerce between Afric and Rome, and it was so easy a passage from one to the other, that it would be unreasonable to think he did not visit that great city. Eusebius tells us that he was a person of note and eminence there<sup>p</sup>. And we know from his own words that he was there<sup>q</sup>.

Was it not an easy matter for him in that great

<sup>h</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 2. c. 2. p. 32, B. Hieron. in Catal.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Apol. c. 18. p. 17, C.

<sup>k</sup> De Vit. Tertull.

<sup>l</sup> L. 1. c. 15. p. 372, C.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Pamel. de Vit. Tertull. Cave. Basnage in Ann. 200. §. 3. et 4.

<sup>n</sup> Apol. c. 9. p. 9, B. fin. et de Pallio, c. 1. p. 112, B. fin. Hieron. in Catal.

<sup>o</sup> Hieron. in Catal.

<sup>p</sup> E. H. l. 2. c. 2. p. 32, B. med.

<sup>q</sup> De Cultu Fœm. c. 7. p. 152, C.

city to find out persons who could give him certain information concerning the authors of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles? Had he admitted any the least doubt concerning them, we may be sure from the warmth of his temper that he would leave no method untried by which there was hope of obtaining satisfaction. In his book, which he calls *De Præscriptione*, wrote against the heretics in general, he has this exhortation: "Come on, you that have a mind to exercise your curiosity in the affair of your salvation; run through the apostolic churches, in which the chairs of the apostles still preside in their room, in which the authentic letters themselves of the apostles are read, uttering the voice and representing the countenance of each one. Is Achaia nearest to you? You have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have the Thessalonians. If you can go into Asia, you have Ephesus. If you lie near Italy, you have Rome, whence also authority is near at hand for us. This, how happy a church! to which the apostles poured forth the whole doctrine of Christ together with their own blood; where Peter underwent a like suffering with our Lord; where Paul was crowned with the death of John the Baptist; where the apostle John, after he had been immersed in scalding oil, and suffered nothing from it, was banished to an island. Let us see what this church learnt, and what it has taught<sup>r</sup>."

If Tertullian had entertained any the least scruple concerning the authority of the four Gospels, or the

<sup>r</sup> C. 36. p. 215, A.



Acts of the Apostles, would he not have pursued the method which he here directs others to? could he have rested till he had found the satisfaction he desired? In one of his books against Marcion, who received only the Gospel according to St. Luke, rejecting the other three, and corrupting even that, he argues thus: “ In fine, if it be plain that that Gospel “ is the truer which is the first; that the first which “ is from the beginning; and that from the beginning which is from the apostles; it will be equally “ plain, that that was delivered by the apostles “ which has been held sacred in the churches of the “ apostles. Let us see what milk the Corinthians “ drew from St. Paul, by what rule the Galatians “ were reformed, what the Philippians, Thessalonians, and Ephesians read, what the Romans, who “ are very near us, sound forth, to whom Peter “ and Paul left the gospel sealed with their own “ blood. We have also the churches fostered by “ John. For though Marcion reject his revelation, “ yet the series of bishops in those churches, reckoned back to their beginning, will rest upon John as “ the author. In the same manner the original also “ of other churches is known. I say, therefore, that “ that Gospel of Luke which we defend has been “ approved and established in those churches from “ the time it was first published; and not in the “ apostolic churches alone, but in all those which “ are joined in communion with them; but that “ that of Marcion is unknown to most of them, and “ known to none that do not condemn it. That “ Gospel also has churches; but they are peculiar to “ it, both of a late standing, and adulterate, whose “ original, if you inquire into, you shall more easily

“ find them apostate than apostolic, Marcion being  
 “ their founder, or some one out of his swarm.  
 “ Wasps also make honeycombs, and Marcionites  
 “ make churches. The same authority of the apo-  
 “ stolic churches will also patronise the other Gos-  
 “ pels, which are equally conveyed down to us by  
 “ them, I mean those of John, Matthew, and Mark.  
 “ Concerning these Marcion is to be asked, Why,  
 “ omitting these, he has insisted upon that of Luke?  
 “ As though these also were not in the churches  
 “ from the beginning, as well as that of Luke<sup>s</sup>.”

He has more to the same purpose, which would take up too much of your time to transcribe. His account of the authors of the four Gospels is in brief this: “ That two of them were written by the apo-  
 “ stles Matthew and John, and two by apostolic  
 “ men<sup>t</sup>; the one the follower of Paul, the other of  
 “ Peter: that St. Mark wrote the Gospel preached  
 “ by Peter, and St. Luke the Gospel preached by  
 “ Paul<sup>u</sup>, and confirmed by the other apostles<sup>x</sup>.”  
 From these passages it is abundantly evident that Tertullian had not been wanting in his inquiry to know upon what authority the churches received the four Gospels, and that he was fully persuaded they were received upon the authority of the apostles themselves; in particular, that the Gospel of St. Luke was so; and if the Gospel, the Acts of the Apostles also, which was but *δεύτερος λόγος*, the second treatise, of that whereof the Gospel was *πρῶτος*, the first. That this was his real sentiment, though he has not here expressed it, is evident from other

<sup>s</sup> Adv. Marc. l. 4. c. 5, pr. p. 415.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. c. 2. p. 414.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. c. 5. p. 416, pr.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. c. 2. p. 414, D. et l. 5. c. 3, pr. p. 463, B.

passages of his works, as particularly in his book *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*. Cerdo the heretic, and Marcion his scholar, rejected the Acts of the Apostles, as well as three of the Gospels<sup>y</sup>. Tertullian, having shewn that the scriptures were in the possession of the apostolic churches<sup>z</sup>, afterwards, in answer to an objection of the heretics, that the apostles did not know all things, introduces those words of our Saviour, *When the Spirit of truth shall come, he shall lead you into all truth*; and then adds, “He shews that they were ignorant of  
 “ nothing, because he promised that they should ob-  
 “ tain all truth by the Spirit of truth, and he indeed  
 “ fulfilled his promise; the Acts of the Apostles  
 “ proving the descent of the Holy Ghost. Which  
 “ scripture (i. e. the Acts of the Apostles) they who  
 “ receive not cannot be of the Holy Ghost, because  
 “ they cannot know that the Spirit is yet sent down  
 “ on the disciples: neither can they defend the  
 “ church, not being able to prove when, or by what  
 “ beginnings, that body was instituted<sup>a</sup>.” These heretics received some of the Epistles of St. Paul, and particularly that to the Galatians, and quoted some passages from it to support their impious opinions<sup>b</sup>. Tertullian, before he answers to the passages cited by them, makes this preface: “We may here  
 “ also say to those who reject the Acts of the Apo-  
 “ stles, It is necessary that you first shew who is  
 “ Paul, and what he was before an apostle, and how  
 “ he became an apostle. It is not enough that he

<sup>y</sup> De Præscript. c. 51. p. 222, fin.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. c. 15, fin. et c. 19. p. 208, C.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. c. 22. p. 209, fin.

<sup>b</sup> Iren. l. 1. c. 27. §. 2. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 3.

“ professes himself an apostle from a persecutor,  
 “ since our Lord gave not testimony of himself.  
 “ But let them believe without the scriptures, (i. e.  
 “ without the Acts of the Apostles,) as they believe  
 “ things in direct contradiction to the scriptures <sup>c</sup>.”

Origen is another of the persons I have mentioned. He was a prodigy of industry and learning. It is almost impossible to think or speak of him without the utmost admiration. Clemens being driven away from Alexandria by the severe persecution that happened there, about the year of Christ 202 or 203, Origen was placed at the head of the catechetical school in his room, at eighteen years of age <sup>d</sup>. He was acquainted with Pantænus <sup>e</sup>, who had been master of the same school before Clemens as well as with Clemens, and probably had received instructions from both. The fame of his great knowledge and most exemplary life soon spread abroad in the world; which as it occasioned his being sent for by princes and other eminent persons <sup>f</sup>, so it gave him an opportunity of conversing with the most knowing men of the age he lived in <sup>g</sup>. He spared no pains to make himself master of all that was written before his time, whether by heathens, Jews, or Christians; whether orthodox Chris-

<sup>c</sup> De Præscript. c. 23. p. 210, a. Vid. et adv. Marcion. l. 5. c. 1, 2.

<sup>d</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 3. p. 165, fin. p. 166, C. fin.

<sup>e</sup> See the Letter of Alexander bishop of Jerusalem, Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 14. p. 176, pr. Vid. et c. 19. p. 179, fin.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. c. 8. p. 170, B. He was sent for by an Arabian prince, c. 19. p. 180, B. by Mammæa, the mother of Alexander the emperor, c. 21, C. fin. by several bishops, c. 27. He also wrote letters to the emperor Philip and his empress, c. 36, D.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. c. 18, D. et c. 19. p. 179, D.

tians or heretics. He travelled into various parts of the world, was at Rome<sup>h</sup>, was in Greece<sup>i</sup>, Syria<sup>k</sup>, Palestine<sup>l</sup>, and Arabia<sup>m</sup>. And it is certain that there must, even in his time, be many living who could look back to the disciples of the apostle John. Not only Narcissus bishop of Jerusalem, who lived till Origen was thirty-one years of age, and whom we have mentioned before, but much younger persons than he was, even those of eighty, or seventy-five, might with ease be able to do this.

That he would not fail to make such an inquiry after the authors of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles as would give him entire satisfaction, we may be very sure, from the immense pains he took in explaining the scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. What vast fatigue did he undergo in collecting the several interpretations of the books of the Old Testament, and writing comments upon them! What laborious comments did he publish on the four Gospels and most of the Epistles<sup>n</sup>! He wrote also Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles<sup>o</sup>. That he actually did make inquiry concerning the four Gospels, is evident from what he says in the first book of his Exposition on the Gospel of St. Matthew, where he tells us, that he had “learnt from tradition, concerning those four

<sup>h</sup> He desired to see ἀρχαιοτάτην Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν, and came there under Zephyrinus. Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 14. p. 176, A.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. c. 16. p. 177, pr. c. 23. et c. 32. p. 187, fin.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. c. 21, D.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. c. 19. p. 180, B. et c. 23, D.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. c. 19. p. 180, B.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. l. 6. c. 16. 23. 24. 25. 33. 36. Vid. et Fabric. Biblioth. Græc.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Philocal. c. 7.

“Gospels, which alone are without contradiction in the whole church of God under heaven, that that according to Matthew, who was once a publican, and afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ, was written first: that he published it for those who believed of the Jewish nation, being composed in Hebrew: that the second was that according to Mark, who wrote it as Peter dictated to him; whom therefore, in his catholic Epistle, he avouches for his son, saying, *The church which is in Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, and so does Marcus my son.* And the third is that according to Luke, the Gospel commended by Paul, written for those who were converted from among the Gentiles. The last of all, that according to John<sup>p</sup>.” And in his Homilies upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, after having said that the sentiments in that Epistle are those of the apostle Paul, but the diction that of some disciple of his, adds, that “the ancients have not without cause delivered it down as St. Paul’s; and the history of this matter, which is come to us, is this: Some say that Clemens, who was bishop of Rome, wrote the Epistle; others, that Luke did, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts<sup>q</sup>,” meaning, that one of these two was that disciple of St. Paul who put his sentiments into their own language<sup>r</sup>. I have cited this passage to shew that Origen was not wanting in his diligence “to find out the authors of the several parts of scripture in the New Testament.”

Eusebius is the last person I mentioned. He was

<sup>p</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 24. p. 184, A. fin.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. p. 184, fin. et 185, A. B.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. l. 3. c. 38.



born about the year of Christ 270, and departed this life not long after the death of Constantine the Great, about the year 340<sup>s</sup>. He was first a presbyter of the church of Cæsarea in Palestine, and afterwards bishop of the same church; a man of great learning, and in high esteem not only with his brethren the bishops, but with Constantine himself. He wrote many things admirably well against the enemies of Christianity, both heathens and heretics. But that which we are the most indebted to him for is his Ecclesiastical History, wherein he has related a great variety of facts, which we must have been wholly ignorant of, and transcribed many passages from ancient authors, which otherwise we should never have seen. It was with no little pains and difficulty he read over the writings of the Christians that went before him, and thence composed his History. He expressly tells us, that the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles were scriptures of the New Testament universally received by the church of Christ<sup>t</sup>, and that without any contradiction<sup>u</sup>. It is true they were not received by some heretics, as he himself informs us<sup>x</sup>; but these were never esteemed part of the Christian church, nor indeed deserved the name of Christians. As to the most of them, they might be called philosophers, or romancers, but forasmuch as they denied the very

\* Vid. Cave's Hist. Literar. et Fabric. Bibl. Græc.

<sup>t</sup> E. H. l. 3. c. 25.

<sup>u</sup> Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις. Τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, &c. Ibid. p. 78, A. Διακρίναντες τὰς τε κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν ἀληθεῖς καὶ ἀπλάστους καὶ ἀνωμολογουμένας γραφαίς, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας παρὰ ταύτας, οὐκ ἐνδιαθήκους μὲν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντιλεγομένας. B. fin. C.

<sup>x</sup> L. 4. c. 29. p. 122, B.

fundamental principles of the Christian religion, and had a faith of their own invention, the mere fruit of imagination, without any the least foundation either in reason or scripture<sup>y</sup>, they could in no sense be allowed the name of Christians<sup>z</sup>.

Eusebius further says, that these books “were delivered down by the church as true and uncorrupted, and acknowledged by all from the begin-

<sup>y</sup> Non erit Christianus, qui eam negabit, quam confitentur Christiani; et his argumentis negabit, quibus utitur non Christianus. Aufer denique hæreticis, quæ cum ethnicis sapiunt, ut de scripturis solis quæstiones suas sistant; et stare non poterunt. *Tertull. de Resur. Carnis*, c. 3. p. 327, C.

<sup>z</sup> Καὶ Χριστιανούς ἑαυτοὺς λέγουσιν ὃν τρόπον οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἔθνεσι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιγράφουσι ταῖς χειροποιήτοις. *Just. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 253, D. Vid. p. 306, D. p. 308, C. *Apol.* p. 70, A. et p. 92, A. Qui quidem Epicuri philosophiam, et Cynicorum indifferentiam æmulantes, Jesum magistrum gloriantur. *Iren.* l. 2. c. 32. §. 2, fin. Si enim hæretici sunt, Christiani esse non possunt, non a Christo habendo, quod de sua electione sectati hæreticorum nomine admittunt. Ita non Christiani nullum jus capiunt Christianarum literarum. Ad quos merito dicendum est, Qui estis? Quando et unde venistis? Quid in meo agitis, non mei? Quo denique, Marcion, jure sylvam meam cædis? Qua licentia, Valentine, fontes meos transvertis? Qua potestate, Apelles, limites meos commoves? Mea est possessio. Quid hic cæteri ad voluntatem vestram seminatis et pascitis? Mea est possessio, olim possideo, prior possideo, habeo origines firmas, ab ipsis auctoribus quorum fuit res. Ego sum hæres apostolorum. Sicut caverunt testamento suo, sicut fidei commiserunt, sicut adjuraverunt, ita teneo. Vos certe exhæredaverunt semper et abdicaverunt, ut extraneos, ut inimicos. Unde autem extranei et inimici apostolis hæretici, nisi ex diversitate doctrinæ, quam unusquisque de suo arbitrio adversus apostolos aut protulit aut recepit? &c. *Tertull. de Præscript. Hær.* c. 37, 38. p. 215, C. Vid. et *Euseb. E. H.* l. 3. c. 26. p. 79, B. fin. l. 4. c. 7. p. 97, fin. et 22. p. 115, D 116, A. et c. 11. p. 100, D.

“ning<sup>a</sup>,” i. e. by all Christian churches, by all which descended from the apostles in opposition to the heretical ones, which descended from their several founders, who were later than the apostles. And was it not easy for him to know this from the ancient copies of these books preserved in the several churches, from the tradition handed down from time to time by grave, wise, and elderly men, but more especially from the writings that were then extant, both of Christians and heretics? It was but little more than 230 years from the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul, and scarcely 200 years from the death of the apostle John, when Eusebius was full thirty years of age. It is now about the same distance of time since the beginning of the reformation. Is it a difficult matter for us to look back to that time in the writings both of protestants and of papists, and to learn what books were received by each as scripture, and what were rejected? When Eusebius says that the Gospel of St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles were universally acknowledged by the Christian church from the beginning, he means that they were received and acknowledged as written by St. Luke. I am fully persuaded, that this was a thing in his time so notorious, from the strong current of tradition, and the many writings then extant, that a very small inquiry was abundantly sufficient to give any man the fullest satisfaction therein.

<sup>a</sup> Τὰς κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν ἀληθεῖς, καὶ ἀπλάστους, καὶ ἀνωμολογημένας γραφαῖς, p. 78, C.

## CHAP. XV.

*That the Acts of the Apostles was owned and received by the Christians in the first ages as a sacred book.*

HAVING laid before you the proofs there are that St. Luke wrote the History of the Acts, I proceed now to shew that it was received by the Christians in the first ages as a sacred book. And in doing this I shall invert the method I before used, shall begin at the time of Constantine the Great, and go backwards. Eusebius, who had with great pains perused the writings of those who went before him, who well knew what their sense of this matter was, and expressly undertakes to represent it <sup>a</sup>, says, “ Luke, born at Antioch, by profession a physician, “ who was mostly with Paul, though he conversed “ not a little with the other apostles, has left us, in “ two divinely inspired books, samples of the art of “ healing souls, which he learnt from the apostles, “ that is, in the Gospel which he declares to have “ written, as those who from the beginning were “ eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word delivered “ it to him, all of whom he professes to have followed from the beginning; and in the Acts of the “ Apostles, which he composed not as he received by “ hearsay from others, but as an eyewitness <sup>b</sup>.”

<sup>a</sup> Προϊούσης δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας, προὔργου ποιήσομαι σὺν ταῖς διαδοχαῖς ὑποσημνήσθαι, τίνες τῶν κατὰ χρόνους ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων, ὁποίαις κέχρηται τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων· τίνα τε περὶ τῶν ἐνδιαθῆκων καὶ ὁμολογουμένων γραφῶν, καὶ ὅσα περὶ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων αὐτοῖς εἴρηται. L. 3. c. 3, C. fin.

<sup>b</sup> L. 3. c. 4. p. 58, D.

As he here expressly tells us that not only St. Luke's Gospel, but that the Acts also, was a divinely inspired book, so he perpetually quotes it as such. Thus, in the beginning of his second book, having professed to continue his History from the sacred writings<sup>c</sup>, he gives an account of the election of Matthias into the number of the apostles, of the ordaining of the seven deacons, and of the martyrdom of St. Stephen, from the Acts of the Apostles; then adding some particulars from Clemens of Alexandria, and the Chronicle of Edessa, when he returns to the History of the Acts, he says, "But let us pass again to the divine scripture<sup>d</sup>." Then giving a brief account of the dispersion of the disciples after the martyrdom of Stephen, he has this expression; "Some of them, as says the divine scripture, went as far as Phœnice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to the Jews only." And again, having related that Herod beheaded James the brother of John, he proceeds; "Then, as saith the divine scripture, Herod perceiving that what was done pleased the Jews, he laid hold on Peter also<sup>e</sup>:" and in the next chapter shews the agreement of the History of the Acts, which he there also calls the divine scripture, with the History of Josephus, in the death of Herod Agrippa<sup>f</sup>. He not only thus expressly asserts that the Acts of the Apostles was a divinely inspired book, but he also says, "that it was from the beginning unanimously re-

<sup>c</sup> Τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν θείων παρασημαίνόμενοι γραμμάτων. Proœm. fin.

<sup>d</sup> Μετίωμεν δ' αὖθις ἐπὶ τὴν θείαν γραφήν. L. 2. c. 1. p. 30, D.

<sup>e</sup> L. 2. c. 9, B.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. c. 10. p. 37, D. et p. 38, D. ἡ ἱερὰ τῶν πράξεων γραφή. C. 18, fin.

“ceived by all the churches as part of the New Testament, or sacred code of divinely inspired books<sup>g</sup>.” The consequence of which is, that it was from the beginning publicly read in all the churches as a sacred book. For when he speaks of those books which were controverted, which were not unanimously admitted by all as part of the New Testament, but rejected by some; as a proof that they were received by others, he says, “that they were publicly read by them in their churches<sup>h</sup>.” And of the public reading the scriptures of the New Testament in the churches, we have manifest footsteps in most of the writers which precede him, even from the beginning of Christianity<sup>i</sup>.

Cyprian, who was bishop of Carthage, and suffered martyrdom in the year of Christ 258<sup>k</sup>, wrote several tracts and epistles, which are come down to us. In these he frequently quotes the Acts of the

<sup>g</sup> L. 3. c. 25, tit. pr. et p. 78, B. fin. et C.

<sup>h</sup> Thus of the Epistle of James. L. 2. c. 23, fin. Of the Pastor of Hermas. L. 3. c. 3. p. 58, A. Of the Epistle of Clemens. Ibid. c. 16. And of all the controverted books in general. Τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων μὲν, ὅμως δ' ἐν πλείσταις ἐκκλησίαις παρὰ πολλοῖς δεδημοσιευμένων. Ibid. c. 31, prop. fin.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Apostol. Constit. l. 2. c. 57. p. 265. Cyprian. Ep. 23. 29. 39. Tertull. adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 5, pr. p. 415, D. De Præscript. Hær. c. 41, fin. p. 217, C. Apol. c. 22. p. 22, A. fin. Coimus ad literarum divinarum commemorationem—certe fidem sanctis vocibus pascimus, spem erigimus, fiduciam figimus, &c. c. 39. p. 31, A. Καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροῖς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀπιστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. Εἴτα παυσάμενου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, κ. τ. λ. Just. Mart. Ap. p. 98, C. D. The scriptures were also read in private families. Vid. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7. p. 860, fin.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Annal. Cyprian.



Apostles as of the same authority with the other divinely inspired writings<sup>1</sup>. In the preface to his two books of Testimonies against the Jews, he professes to collect those Testimonies from the divine fountain, i. e. the scriptures of the Old and New Testament; and among the other scriptures he quotes the Acts of the Apostles in both these books<sup>m</sup>. In the preface to his third book of Testimonies he declares, that he has gathered out of the sacred scriptures certain heads pertaining to the religious discipline of Christians. To compose these *capitula*, or heads, are frequent citations from the Acts of the Apostles, as well as from other parts of the inspired writings<sup>n</sup>. And one of these heads has no text whatever cited but from the Acts<sup>o</sup>. In another place also he quotes it under the name of the divine scripture. It is in his treatise of the Unity of the Church<sup>p</sup>. “This unanimity was of old under  
 “the apostles; so the new people of believers, keep-  
 “ing the commandment of the Lord, held fast their  
 “charity. The divine scripture proves this, which  
 “says, *And the multitude of them that believed*  
 “*were of one heart and of one soul*: and again,  
 “*And they all continued with one accord in prayer*  
 “*with the women and Mary, the mother of Jesus,*

<sup>1</sup> Vid. de Hab. Virg. p. 93. compared with p. 97. de Opere et Eleemos. p. 201. compared with 208. Ep. 3. p. 6. Ep. 59. p. 128. et 64. p. 161. et 66. p. 166. et 72. p. 196. et 73. p. 202. et 209. et 75. p. 221.

<sup>m</sup> L. 1. c. 21. p. 29. et l. 2. c. 16. p. 42.

<sup>n</sup> C. 3. p. 62. c. 14. p. 68. c. 30. p. 74. pr. c. 61. p. 83. c. 89. p. 87. c. 100. p. 88. c. 101. p. 89. c. 119. p. 91.

<sup>o</sup> C. 44. p. 77.

<sup>p</sup> P. 119, prop. fin.

“ *and with his brethren.*” Both which passages are taken from the Acts of the Apostles <sup>q</sup>.

And although it is true, that he frequently cites the apocryphal books of the Old Testament also as scripture, yet he seems to distinguish them as not altogether of the same authority with the other sacred writings, and particularly with the Acts of the Apostles. Having quoted a passage from the book of Tobit, wherein Raphael the angel is introduced as saying, *Prayer is good with fasting, and alms for alms doth deliver from death, and purges away sin* <sup>r</sup>, he adds, “ We do not so produce this, my dear brethren, as not to prove what the angel Raphael said by the testimony of truth. In the Acts of the Apostles is there proof of the fact; and that alms does deliver, not only from the second death of the soul, but from the first death, is found true by an example of the thing itself <sup>s</sup>.” Then follows the history of Peter’s raising Dorcas from the dead, who was full of good works and almsdeeds that she did.

Origen was born about the year of Christ 185, and, after many sharp sufferings for the sake of Christianity, died about the year 253 or 254. He left many voluminous writings behind him, of which very few are come down to us entire. There are, however, sufficient to let us know that he esteemed the Acts of the Apostles a sacred and divinely inspired book. He divides the sacred writings into

<sup>q</sup> Acts iv. 32. and i. 14.

<sup>r</sup> Tob. xii. 8, 9.

<sup>s</sup> Nec sic, fratres carissimi, ista proferimus, ut non quod Raphael angelus dixit veritatis testimonio comprobemus. In Actibus Apostolorum facti fides posita est, &c. *De Opere et Eleemos.* p. 199.

those of the Old Testament and those of the New<sup>t</sup>; and not asserts, but plainly proves, that they were both divinely inspired<sup>u</sup>. He cites passages from the Acts of the Apostles, which he expressly calls “sayings of the New Testament<sup>x</sup>.” And speaking of this History by name, terms it *the divine scripture*. It is in his Commentary upon Matthew. Having produced an example of a heathen, who sold all that he had, and gave it away, he adds, “But if any one is willing to be persuaded by the divine scripture concerning this, that it is a thing practicable, let him give ear to that which is related by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles;” and then quotes passages from the second and fourth chapters of that book<sup>y</sup>. And, in his Commentary upon the Gospel according to St. John, he places the Acts of the Apostles among those writings which are in all the churches of God believed to be divine<sup>z</sup>: and in the same place contends, that not only the four Gospels, but the whole New Testament, including the Acts and the Epistles, may be called the Gospel<sup>a</sup>; and it is certain, that the word *gospel* is to be thus understood in several places in the writings of the ancient fathers<sup>b</sup>. It is almost needless to add after this, that Origen very frequently quotes the Acts, together with the other scriptures, as authoritative proofs of what he is maintaining<sup>c</sup>, and that he wrote Ho-

<sup>t</sup> Philocal. p. 1, pr.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. p. 4, prop. fin. p. 5, 6. p. 7. l. 20. p. 8. l. 4, &c. p. 11. l. 5, &c. p. 12, prop. fin. p. 19, prop. fin. p. 31. c. 6. in Reg. p. 30, D. in Jer. p. 75, A. B.

<sup>x</sup> Philocal. p. 106.

<sup>y</sup> P. 382, D.

<sup>z</sup> P. 4, A. B.

<sup>a</sup> P. 4. 5. 6. 8.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. c. 47. Not. 7.

<sup>c</sup> Περὶ ἐκχρῆς, p. 20. 60. 76. 158. Adv. Cels. p. 56. 57. 58. 81.

milies upon the Acts of the Apostles, as well as upon other parts of the sacred writings<sup>d</sup>.

Tertullian wrote most of his tracts between the years of Christ 200 and 212. He divides the scriptures also into those of the Old and those of the New Testament<sup>e</sup>; and he divides those of the New Testament into *Evangelica* and *Apostolica*: under the former are contained the four Gospels; under the latter, the Acts of the Apostles and their Epistles. Thus in his book *de Resurrectione Carnis*, having brought his proofs from the Old Testament, he says, *Satis hæc prophetico instrumento, ad Evangelica nunc provoco*; “Enough has been said from “the Prophets, I now appeal to the Gospels<sup>f</sup>.” Having finished his proofs from the Gospels, he proceeds thus: *Resurrectionem apostolica quoque instrumenta testantur*; “The apostolic instruments also “prove a resurrection:” and begins his proofs under this head from the Acts of the Apostles; mentioning the profession which Paul made before the Jewish sanhedrim, and again before Agrippa, and what he preached to the Athenians<sup>g</sup>. He does the same thing in his book *de Pudicitia*. Having despatched the question so far as related to the Gospels<sup>h</sup>, he says, “Well, now let them teach from the apostolic

86. 98. 117. 164. 386, pr. Com. vol. 1. p. 32, D. 74, D. 104, B. 218, C. 244, B. 332, E. 408, B. C. vol. 2. p. 23, D. 13, C. 15, A. fin. 155, B. 182, fin. 183, pr. 212, A. 260, B. fin. 304, C. fin. 360, A.

<sup>d</sup> Philocal. p. 32.

<sup>e</sup> Adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 1. p. 413, A. B. C. D. c. 6. c. 22. p. 437, A. B. De Jejun. c. 11, pr. p. 550, B. De Pudicit. c. 1. p. 555, A. Apol. c. 47. p. 36, D. p. 37, A. fin.

<sup>f</sup> C. 32. p. 345, A.

<sup>g</sup> C. 39. p. 348, C.

<sup>h</sup> C. 10, fin. p. 563, B.

“instrument:” and presently after, “We salute the form of the old law also in the apostles;” and immediately begins his proofs from the Acts of the Apostles<sup>i</sup>. The same division of the books of the New Testament is also made by Origen<sup>k</sup>: for having said, “It becomes us to believe that the sacred writings have not one tittle empty of the divine wisdom; for he that commands me, a human creature, saying, *Thou shalt not appear before me empty*, most certainly will not himself utter any thing that is empty;” presently adds, “And there is nothing in the Prophets, or the Law, or the Gospel, or the Apostles, which is not of his fulness<sup>l</sup>.” In another place also he says, that “the oracles of God are contained in the Law and the Prophets, and in the Gospels and the Apostles<sup>m</sup>.” As the Law and the Prophets are here put for the Old Testament, so the Gospel and the Apostles include the New. All which, he plainly tells us, are the word of God, derived from, and savouring of his fulness. And this division of the New Testament is continued down in the liturgies of the church to this day<sup>n</sup>.

<sup>i</sup> C. 12. p. 563, C.

<sup>k</sup> Philocal. p. 12, prop. fin. c. 6.

p. 31. c. 11. p. 39. in Matt. p. 216, A. et p. 220, D.

<sup>l</sup> Philocal. c. 1. p. 19, fin.

<sup>m</sup> Hom. 10. in Jer. vol. 1. p. 107, pr. The same division is made by Irenæus, l. 1. c. 3. §. 6. p. 17, fin. and by Clemens Alex. Strom. l. 7. p. 890. l. 28. p. 892. l. 13. and by Euseb. E. H. l. 2. c. 17. p. 44, B. fin. and Heraclitus wrote *Εἰς Ἀπόστολον*, i. e. as I suppose, Commentaries on the Acts and the Epistles. Euseb. E. H. l. 5. c. 27. And Marcion the heretic had his *Apostolicum* as well as his *Evangelicum*. Vid. Ittigii Hær. p. 153. et Pamel. Not. in Tertul. adv. Marc. l. 1. n. 2. p. 755.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Leo Allatius in Fabr. Bibl. vol. 5. p. 242 et 244.

There is no one who has read Tertullian, but must be convinced that he was fully in the opinion that the writings both of the Old and New Testament were inspired. In his Apology he has these words: "You that think we are unmindful of the health and safety of the Cæsars, look into the word of God, our scriptures, which we conceal not ourselves, and which many accidents have put into the hands of strangers. Know ye, that we are therein commanded, even to an excess of goodwill, to intercede with God for our enemies, and to pray for good things to our persecutors. Who are the enemies and persecutors of Christians more than those by whose majesty and authority they are convened to answer for their lives? But God in his word says also openly and expressly, *Pray ye for kings, and princes, and potentates* <sup>o</sup>."

As he in this and other parts of his works speaks of the whole scripture as the word of God, and divine <sup>p</sup>, so very frequently, when he mentions particular books, he speaks of them as inspired <sup>q</sup>. He calls the Acts of the Apostles *instrumentum Actorum* <sup>r</sup>, which seems to be a favourite name fixed upon by him to signify the inspired writings <sup>s</sup>. Thus

<sup>o</sup> C. 31. p. 27.

<sup>p</sup> Inspice Dei voces, literas nostras. Vox Divina ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 2. p. 168, pr. Sacrosancto stylo, de Resurr. Carnis, c. 22. p. 337, 338. Scripturæ divinæ, adv. Judæos, c. 1. p. 184, A. and c. 11. p. 198, A. Apol. c. 20. p. 18, C. Vid. et c. 18. et de Cultu Fœm. c. 3. p. 151, B.

<sup>q</sup> Majestas Spiritus Sancti in ipsa ad Thessalonicenses Epistola suggerit. De Resurr. Carnis, c. 24. p. 339, D. Vid. adv. Marcion, l. 5. c. 7, pr. Ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 2. p. 167, D. et de Coron. Mil. c. 4. p. 103, A.

<sup>r</sup> Adv. Marcion, l. 5. c. 2. p. 463, A.

<sup>s</sup> Vid. adv. Marcion, l. 4. pr.



he calls the Old Testament *vetus instrumentum*<sup>t</sup>; the Prophets, *instrumentum propheticum*<sup>u</sup>; the four Gospels, *instrumentum evangelicum*<sup>x</sup>; and the Acts of the Apostles, together with the Epistles, *instrumenta apostolica*<sup>y</sup>, and *instrumentum apostolicum*<sup>z</sup>; the Revelation of St. John, *instrumentum Joannis*<sup>a</sup>. He very frequently cites the Acts of the Apostles in proof of what he is maintaining, in the very same manner as he does the other inspired writings<sup>b</sup>; I have already shewn you that he does so in his book *de Pudicitia*, and in his proof of the resurrection.

He also informs us that the churches of Christ esteemed the books of the Old and New Testament to be the fountain and foundation of their faith. For after having directed his reader to the apostolic churches, in the place I have quoted in the foregoing chapter, and having mentioned the church of Rome as near to the African churches, and holding communion with them, he adds, “She acknowledges  
“ one God the Creator of the universe, and Christ  
“ Jesus, of the Virgin Mary, the Son of the Creator,  
“ and the resurrection of the body. And she mingles

<sup>t</sup> Evangelium ut supplementum Instrumenti Veteris adhibebo. *Adv. Hermog.* c. 20. p. 240, D. et de Monogamia, c. 7. p. 528, D. *Vid. Apolog.* c. 18, 19. 21. p. 17, B. p. 18, A. B. D. *Adv. Jud.* p. 184, A. de *Præscript.* c. 38. p. 216, A. *Adv. Marcion*, l. 5. c. 13. p. 477, C. *De Resurr. Carnis*, c. 63. p. 365, pr.

<sup>u</sup> *De Resurr. Carnis*, c. 33, pr. p. 345, A.

<sup>x</sup> *Adv. Marcion*, l. 4. c. 2. p. 414, B.

<sup>y</sup> *De Resurr. Carnis*, c. 39 p. 348, C.

<sup>z</sup> *De Pudic.* c. 12. p. 563, C.

<sup>a</sup> *De Resurr. Carnis*, c. 38. p. 348, B.

<sup>b</sup> *De Resurr. Carnis*, c. 22, 23, 24. *De Carne Christi*, c. 15, 24. *Scorpiace*, c. 15. p. 499. *De Idololat.* c. 9. p. 90, &c. &c. &c.

“ the Law and the Prophets with *Evangelica* and “ *Apostolica*, the Gospel and the Apostles, and thence “ drinks her faith<sup>c</sup>.” This is all said in opposition to the heretics, against whom he writes. For they held another God besides the Creator, and said that Christ was not the Son of the Creator, denied the resurrection of the body, and rejected the Law and the Prophets. When he says that “ she mingles the “ Law and the Prophets with the Gospel and Apostles,” he means that all these were received and publicly read in the church of Rome; and probably also, that they were mixed in their reading, so as that part of the Old Testament, part of the Gospel, part of the Acts, or of the Epistles, were all read at one and the same time of their assembling, much in the same manner as it is at this day in our established church. Having said that “ she mingles” these, he carries on the metaphor, and adds, “ she thence “ drinks her faith,” i. e. takes her faith from those writings. It is abundantly evident from the context, that what he here asserts of the church of Rome, he would have understood of all the churches founded by the apostles. The Law and the Prophets, the Gospel and the Apostles, that is, the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, were the fountain whence they received their faith. And I have already fully proved to you, that under the name of *Apostolica*, Tertullian includes the Acts of the Apostles, and that in agreement with the church of Rome, and the other apostolic churches, he drew his faith of the resurrection of the dead, and other

<sup>c</sup> De Præscript. Hær. c. 36. p. 215, B.

doctrines, from thence, as well as from other parts of scripture.

Another thing which demonstrates that he held the Acts of the Apostles as a sacred and inspired book, and part of the rule of faith to Christians, is the argument he makes use of against the heretics who rejected it. The Marcionites admitted the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, though they rejected the Acts of the Apostles. Tertullian having shewn that the Epistle to the Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles agree in the narration of the same facts, and that the very subject-matter of that Epistle is recognised by the Acts, adds, “ But if the “ Acts of the Apostles agree herein with Paul, it “ now plainly appears why they reject the Acts; “ and that is, because they preach no other God “ than the Creator, nor Christ the Son of any other “ than the Creator; nor can it be proved that the “ promise of the Holy Ghost has been fulfilled any “ otherwise than by the instrument of the Acts<sup>d</sup>.” Which last words are agreeable to what you may remember I quoted from him before, where he says, “ that they who receive not the Acts of the Apo- “ stles cannot be of the Holy Ghost, because they “ cannot know that the Spirit is yet sent down on “ the disciples; neither can they defend the church, “ not being able to prove when, or by what begin- “ nings, that body was instituted<sup>e</sup>.” Hence, you see, Tertullian esteemed the Acts of the Apostles to be an essential part of the sacred writings, absolutely

<sup>d</sup> Adv. Marcion, l. 5. c. 2. p. 463, A.

<sup>e</sup> De Præscript. Hær. c. 22. p. 209, fin.

necessary to prove the descent of the Holy Ghost, and rise of the Christian church.

To give you some notion what was the sense of the Christians who lived at the same time with Tertullian, about the inspiration of the holy scriptures, I shall transcribe a passage from an anonymous writer, preserved by Eusebius. He was author of a book against the heresy of Artemon, who had much the same notions of Christ with our modern Socinians. He charges them with corrupting the sacred writings, and appeals to the copies which they called corrected or amended, as differing not only from those preserved in the churches, but also from one another. He then adds, "This is a sin of so  
" audacious a nature, that it is not probable they  
" can themselves be ignorant of it. For either they  
" believe not that the sacred scriptures were indited  
" by the Holy Ghost, and are unbelievers; or they  
" esteem themselves wiser than the Holy Ghost, and  
" are mad or possessed. For they cannot deny that  
" this is their own doing, because the books are  
" written with their own hands, and they received  
" not such books from those by whom they were at  
" first instructed in the Christian religion, nor can  
" they shew the copies from whence they transcribed  
" them<sup>f</sup>." Hence, you see, that at this time all who did not believe the inspiration of the sacred writings were ranked among unbelievers.

Clemens succeeded Pantænus in the catechetical school of Alexandria, as I have already observed, about the year of Christ 189; and wrote those works of his which are come down to us within a very few

<sup>f</sup> E. H. l. 5. c. ult. prop. fin.

years after. That part of his writings which would have given us most light into his sentiments concerning the holy scriptures in general, and the Acts of the Apostles in particular, is unhappily lost. It contained eight books, Ὑποτυπώσεων, of Institutions, and was, as Eusebius informs us, a brief exposition of all the scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament <sup>g</sup>, consequently of the Acts of the Apostles. For we are very sure that the History of the Acts is, in the style of Eusebius, one part, ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς, being expressly said by him to be a book of the New Testament <sup>h</sup>.

There are, however, writings of Clemens preserved sufficient to give us the most ample satisfaction that he firmly believed the scriptures of both Testaments to be divinely inspired. He not only calls them sacred books <sup>i</sup>, and divine writings <sup>k</sup>, but

<sup>g</sup> E. H. l. 6. c. 14, pr. Vid. Vales. Not. ibi, et in l. 5. c. 11. Pantænus, his predecessor, had wrote something of the same kind before him. Vid. l. 5. c. 10, fin. et l. 6. c. 13. p. 174, A. Clemens divides the scriptures into those of the Old and of the New Testament. Strom. l. 5. p. 697. l. 24. Pædag. l. 1. p. 133. l. 17. Strom. l. 7. p. 899. l. 15. et l. 5. p. 669. l. 2. et l. 2. p. 444. l. 29. et p. 454. l. 3. et l. 1. p. 342. l. 30. Quis Dives Salvetur, c. 3. p. 937. l. 26. He divides the New Testament also into the Gospel and Apostles, Ἐχομεν γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς διδασκαλίας τὸν Κύριον, διὰ τε τῶν προφητῶν, διὰ τε τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ διὰ τῶν μακαρίων ἀποστόλων, πολυτρόπως καὶ πολυμερῶς ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τέλος ἡγουμένον τῆς γνώσεως. Strom. l. 7. p. 890. l. 28. et p. 892. l. 13.

<sup>h</sup> L. 3. c. 25, pr. et p. 78, C. et l. 6. c. 14, pr. et c. 25. tit. and cap. compared with l. 3. c. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Βίβλοις ταῖς ἀγίαις. Pæd. l. 3. p. 309. l. 25.

<sup>k</sup> Τῶν θεῶν γραφῶν. Ibid. l. 21. et Strom. l. 2. p. 433. l. 22. et p. 454. l. 25. et l. 7. p. 890. l. 20. p. 896. l. 8. p. 897. l. 34. l. 8. p. 914. l. 30. He also calls them τὰ Βιβλία. Pæd. l. 3. p. 305. l. 9.

when he quotes particular books oftentimes expressly asserts their inspiration<sup>l</sup>, as he also does that of the scriptures in general<sup>m</sup>. He says in one place, “The scriptures which we have believed derive their authority from the Almighty<sup>n</sup>.” He often calls them, “the word of the Lord<sup>o</sup>,” which, he says, “is more worthy of credit than any demonstration; rather, indeed, is the only demonstration<sup>p</sup>.” And in another place, “He that believeth the divine scriptures, having a firm judgment, receiveth a demonstration which cannot be falsified, that is, the word of God, who gave these writings<sup>q</sup>.” And agreeably hereto, in his books called *Pædagogus*, he introduces our Lord as speaking in the Law<sup>r</sup>, and by the Prophets<sup>s</sup>, in the Gospels<sup>t</sup>, and in the Epistles<sup>u</sup>. He says, “that although Moses delivered

<sup>l</sup> Thus he does with regard to the Law. *Strom.* l. 1. p. 421. l. 38. To Deuteronomy. *Pæd.* l. 1. p. 131. l. 11. To the Psalms. *Ibid.* p. 141. l. 25. et p. 149. l. 38. Proverbs. *Strom.* l. 1. p. 331. l. penult. Isaiah. *Pæd.* l. 3. p. 252. l. 8. Ezechiel. *Strom.* l. 2. p. 507. l. 19. The Prophets in general. *Strom.* l. 6. p. 827. l. 33. et l. 7. p. 893. l. 18. The apostles were prophets inspired by the same Spirit. *Strom.* l. 5. p. 669. l. 3. and their discourses were inspired. *Strom.* l. 7. p. 896. l. 11. Vid. Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 14, D.

<sup>m</sup> Cohort. p. 71. l. 25, &c. *Strom.* l. 1. p. 342. l. 35, &c. l. 6. p. 803. l. 32.

<sup>n</sup> *Strom.* l. 4. c. 1. p. 564. l. 17.

<sup>o</sup> *Strom.* l. 7. p. 890. l. 34. et p. 891. l. 3.

<sup>p</sup> *Strom.* l. 7. p. 891, l. 9, &c.

<sup>q</sup> *Strom.* l. 2. p. 433. l. 22. Vid. p. 442. l. 20. p. 454, fin. l. 5. p. 697. l. 23. et 29. l. 6. p. 786. l. 8. l. 7. p. 895. l. 10. et p. 896. l. 7. et 25.

<sup>r</sup> L. 1. p. 131. l. 20.

<sup>s</sup> P. 143—154.

<sup>t</sup> P. 143. l. 12. p. 148. Vid. 145. l. 26.

<sup>u</sup> L. 3. p. 258. l. 19. et l. 3. c. 12. throughout.



“ the Law, he delivered it from the Logos, or the “ divine nature of Christ, as being his servant <sup>x</sup> :” and that “ both the laws served the Logos for the “ instruction of men ; the one, delivered by the “ hand of Moses ; the other, by the apostles <sup>y</sup> .” And that Clemens understood the Acts of the Apostles in particular to be the word of God, is most apparent, because he frequently cites it, together with the other inspired writings, to make proof of what he asserts <sup>z</sup> .

There is nothing, it may be, in which the learned more widely differ, than in the age of Irenæus. Dodwell supposes him to have been born in the year of Christ 97 <sup>a</sup> , Grabe in the year 108 <sup>b</sup> , Tillemont in the year 120 <sup>c</sup> , and Massuet in the year 140 <sup>d</sup> . This difference in opinion arises chiefly from the uncertainty of the time when Polycarp was martyred, which our learned countryman Pearson places in the year of Christ 147 <sup>e</sup> ; others, in the year 169 <sup>f</sup> ; and others in the year 175 <sup>g</sup> . They all agree, however, that Irenæus was bishop of Lyons in the year 177 <sup>h</sup> , and that he wrote his books, which are come

<sup>x</sup> L. 1. c. 7. p. 134, pr.

<sup>y</sup> L. 3. p. 307, fin.

<sup>z</sup> Strom. l. 4. p. 606. l. 30. l. 1. §. 19. p. 371, 372. Pæd. l. 2. p. 175. et p. 202. Strom. l. 6. p. 772, &c. &c.

<sup>a</sup> Dissert. in Iren. 3. c. 17. p. 252.

<sup>b</sup> Prolegom. in Iren.

<sup>c</sup> Massuet. Dissert. præv. in Iren. p. 77. n. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid.

<sup>e</sup> Dissert. de Success. 2. c. 16, 17, 18, 20, &c. Massuet in the year 166. ubi supra.

<sup>f</sup> Usher and Basnage. Vid. Basn. Annal. vol. 2. p. 139. n. 11.

<sup>g</sup> Petit.

<sup>h</sup> Dodwell indeed supposes that Pothinus was martyred in the year 167, and that Irenæus then succeeded him. Dissert. in Iren. p. 294.

down to us, within a few years either before or after that time<sup>i</sup>.

It cannot but be a thing obvious to any one who has looked into his writings, that he was firmly persuaded the scriptures both of the Old and New Testament<sup>k</sup> were inspired, and proceeded from God. He not only calls them *scripturæ divinæ*, *scripturæ Dominicæ*<sup>l</sup>, the divine scriptures, and our Lord's scriptures, but expressly asserts that both the Old and the New Testament have one and the same Author, i. e. the Word of God<sup>m</sup>. In another place he calls them, "the scripture given us by God<sup>n</sup>:" and in the same chapter says, "The scriptures are perfect, being spoken by the Word of God and his Spirit<sup>o</sup>." By the Word of God he means the Logos, the divine nature of Christ; and by the scriptures there it is fully evident from the context that he means the writings both of the Old and New Testament<sup>p</sup>. It is very certain also, from many other places in his works, that what I have before shewn to have been the opinion of Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenæus has frequently declared to be his; that is, that the Law and the Prophets, as well as the Gospel, were the words of our Saviour<sup>q</sup>; and

<sup>i</sup> Pearson de Success. p. 277. Grabe, Proleg. Dodwell, Dissert. in Iren. 4. c. 33, 34. 44. fin. Massuet. Dissert. p. 97.

<sup>k</sup> He divides the scriptures into those of the Old and those of the New Testament. L. 4. c. 15. n. 2. et c. 16. n. 5. et ubique.

<sup>l</sup> L. 2, fin. l. 3. c. 19. n. 2.

<sup>m</sup> L. 4. c. 12. n. 3. c. 13. n. 3, 4.

<sup>n</sup> L. 2. c. 28. n. 3.

<sup>o</sup> *Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ.* Ibid. n. 2.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. c. 27. c. 30. n. 6. c. 35. n. 2. 4.

<sup>q</sup> L. 4. c. 2. n. 3. c. 5. n. 1, 2. c. 6. n. 6. *Utraque Testamenta unus et idem Paterfamilias produxit, Verbum Dei, Dominus noster*

that the writers of the holy scriptures, both those of the Old and those of the New Testament, were under the direction of the Holy Spirit in what they wrote <sup>r</sup>.

He not only cites the Acts of the Apostles under the express name of *scripture* <sup>s</sup>, but he has produced passages from it which amount to a great, I know not whether I may not justly say, the greatest part of that book, as authoritative proofs against the heretics with whom he disputes. He affirms, that “the gospel was by the will of God delivered to us in writing to be the foundation and pillar of our faith <sup>t</sup>.” And it is very plain that he puts the Acts of the Apostles and other writings of the New Testament upon the same footing. For having brought arguments against the heretics from the beginnings of the four Gospels, he passes on to the other part of the New Testament in this manner: “Having therefore examined the opinion of those apostles who have delivered to us the gospel from the beginnings themselves of those Gospels, let us go on to the other apostles, and inquire their opinion concerning God <sup>u</sup>.” And then he quotes the words of Peter, Philip, Paul, Stephen, James, and of the whole assembly of disciples, as related in the Acts of the Apostles. And arguing against those heretics who rejected the Acts of the Apostles, he

Jesus Christus. C. 9. n. 1. c. 11. n. 1. c. 20. n. 4. 7. 11, fin. c. 35. n. 2. med. c. 36. n. 8, prop. fin.

<sup>r</sup> L. 3. c. 6. n. 1. 5, fin. c. 7. n. 2. c. 10. n. 2, prop. fin. n. 4, med. c. 16. n. 1, prop. fin. n. 2, prop. fin. n. 3, fin. n. 9, parenth. c. 21. n. 4. 9, prop. fin. l. 4. Præf. n. 3. c. 2. n. 4. c. 20. n. 8.

<sup>s</sup> L. 3. c. 12. n. 5, pr. et n. 9, fin.

<sup>t</sup> L. 3. c. 1, pr.

<sup>u</sup> L. 3. c. 11, fin. Vid. n. 7, pr. et c. 10, n. ult.

asserts that either they ought to renounce all that was written by Luke, or to receive all. I have already cited several passages to this purpose<sup>x</sup>: I shall now add the sequel of one of them: “And truly if  
 “the disciples of Marcion renounce all that is said  
 “by Luke, they will have no Gospel at all; for, cur-  
 “tailing the Gospel which is according to Luke,  
 “they boast that they have the Gospel. And if the  
 “disciples of Valentine do this, they will cease from  
 “the most of their vain talk. For from hence they  
 “receive many occasions of their subtle discourse,  
 “daring to give an ill interpretation to those things  
 “which are by him well spoken. But, if they shall  
 “be compelled to receive the rest of what Luke has  
 “said, they ought, applying their minds to an en-  
 “tire Gospel, and to the doctrine of the apostles, to  
 “exercise repentance, that they may be safe from  
 “the danger they are in<sup>y</sup>.” By the doctrine of the  
 apostles, he here means the History of the Acts,  
 which is the name he gives it also in another pas-  
 sage that I have before cited from him; where he  
 says, “Perhaps for this reason God hath caused that  
 “very many particulars of the gospel history, which  
 “all are obliged to use, should be related by Luke,  
 “that all receiving the subsequent narration which  
 “he gives of the acts and doctrine of the apostles,  
 “and so having the rule of faith uncorrupted, might  
 “be saved<sup>z</sup>.” Hence I think it is very evident, that  
 according to his sentiments, those who received not  
 the Acts of the Apostles had not an uncorrupted  
 rule of faith.

<sup>x</sup> In the preceding chapter.

<sup>y</sup> L. 3. c. 14. n. 4.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. c. 15. n. 1.

In the beginning of the same chapter he makes the Acts of the Apostles a continuation, or a part of the gospel. These are his words: "We say the same thing also of those who own not the apostle Paul, that they ought either to renounce the other sayings of the gospel, which are come to our knowledge by Luke alone, and not to use them; or, if they receive all those, to receive also his testimony concerning Paul." So that Luke's account of Paul in the Acts of the Apostles is plainly ranked with the sayings of the gospel: and it is very clear upon the whole, that he places the History of the Acts upon the same footing with the gospel, which, himself tells us, was committed to writing that it might be the foundation and pillar of our faith. I have the longer insisted upon what is said by Irenæus, because it is certain that from his acquaintance with Pothinus, Polycarp, and other ancient Christians, some of whom had conversed with the apostles themselves, and others of them with the immediate disciples of the apostles, he could not but well know what regard was to be paid to the writings of St. Luke.

Justin Martyr suffered death for the profession of Christianity about the year of Christ 163<sup>a</sup>, and is thought to have presented his first Apology to the emperor Antoninus Pius about the year 139<sup>b</sup>. He had wrote a book against the heretics before this<sup>c</sup>: and Irenæus quotes some passages from a work of

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Basnage, *Annal.* vol. 2. p. 120. §. 5. and Grabe in *Spicil.* Basnage himself is of opinion that it was in the year 165.

<sup>b</sup> Basnage, *Ann.* vol. 2. p. 85. §. 5. Grabe puts it as late as 152.

<sup>c</sup> Justin. *Mart. Apol.* p. 70, B.

his against Marcion<sup>d</sup>. It is our unhappiness that these books are lost ; nor does it appear that Eusebius himself ever saw them<sup>e</sup>. In these, it is highly probable, he must have urged the heretics with the authority of the books of the New Testament, and therefore must have spoken distinctly of them, more particularly of those written by St. Luke, because Marcion had corrupted his Gospel, and renounced the Acts. We lament also the loss of the works of Philip<sup>f</sup>, of Modestus<sup>g</sup>, of Musanus<sup>h</sup>, of Bardesanes<sup>i</sup>, of Rhodon<sup>k</sup>, of Theophilus<sup>l</sup>, who all, as Eusebius informs us, wrote against Marcion, and that not long after Justin Martyr.

Those works of Justin which are come down to us, being written chiefly against the heathen or the Jew, there was no occasion to say much of the scriptures of the New Testament, or to insist upon their inspiration. However, it is sufficiently evident, even from these, that he believed the inspiration of both Testaments. To lead the emperor into a notion of the Christian faith, and how the truth of it is to be proved, he gives him a brief account of the inspired men who wrote the Old Testament, and of the predictions of Christ contained therein<sup>m</sup>. He frequently appeals to the same prophecies in his dispute with

<sup>d</sup> L. 4. c. 6. n. 2. et l. 5. c. 26. n. 2.

<sup>e</sup> For he quotes both these passages from Irenæus. E. H. l. 4. c. 18, fin.

<sup>f</sup> E. H. l. 4. c. 25.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

<sup>h</sup> L. 4. c. 28.

<sup>i</sup> L. 4. c. 30.

<sup>k</sup> L. 5. c. 13.

<sup>l</sup> L. 4. c. 24, fin.

<sup>m</sup> "Ἀνθρώποι οὖν τινὲς ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ γεγέννηται Θεοῦ προφῆται, δι' ὧν προφητικὸν πνεῦμα προεκήρυξε τὰ γενήσεσθαι μέλλοντα πρὶν ἢ γενέσθαι. Apol. p. 72, B. & c. p. 75, C. p. 78, C. D. 79, 80, B. 81, B. 82, B. 84, C. 86, 88, B. C. 92, C. 93, B. Πνεῦμα ἅγιον διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα. P. 94, D. 95, C. 96, B.



the Jew<sup>n</sup>. He therein also fully proves that the New Testament, or the new Law given to Christians, was foretold in those prophecies<sup>o</sup>; consequently, this new Law, wherever it be found, must come from God; and he himself directs us to find it in the commentaries of the apostles<sup>p</sup>, that is, the writings of the New Testament. In relating to the emperor the Christian manner of worship, he tells him that the commentaries of the apostles and the writings of the prophets were read in their assemblies every Sunday<sup>q</sup>. As the writings of the prophets are there put for the whole Old Testament, so no doubt the commentaries of the apostles are to be understood of all the books of the New Testament: for in the same page, when he speaks of the

<sup>n</sup> Ὡς διὰ τοῦ Ἡσαίου βοᾷ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Dial. p. 242, B. Καὶ ἄλλου Ψαλμοῦ τῷ Δαβὶδ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εἰρημένου ἀναμνήσομαι. P. 251, B. p. 254, D. 255, C. D. 262, A. 274, B. C. 275, B. C. 277, B. C. 298, D. 299, D. 302, D. 303, A. Εἰπόντος διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος οὕτως· Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾶ, κ. τ. λ. p. 304, C. 310, A. B. That our Saviour Christ, or the divine Logos, spake by the prophets, is his opinion also; as well as of Irenæus, and the other fathers: Ὅτι δὲ οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ θεοφοροῦνται οἱ προφητεῦντες εἰ μὴ λόγῳ θεῷ, καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὡς ὑπολαμβάνω, φήσετε. Apol. p. 75, C. 76, C. 77, C.

<sup>o</sup> Νυνὶ δὲ, ἀνέγνων γὰρ, ὃ Τρύφων, ὅτι ἔσοιτο καὶ τελευταῖος νόμος, καὶ διαθήκη κυριωτάτη πασῶν, ἣν νῦν δέον φυλάσσειν πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ὅσοι τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ κληρονομίας ἀντιποιοῦνται, κ. τ. λ. Dial. p. 228, A. B. p. 261, C. p. 292, B. p. 346, C. 351, A. B.

<sup>p</sup> Called by him *the Oracles of Christ*, ἐκείνου λόγια. Dial. p. 235, D. In this Dial. he introduces Trypho saying thus; Ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραγγέλματα θαυμαστὰ οὕτως καὶ μεγάλα ἐπίσταμαι εἶναι, ὡς ὑπολαμβάνειν μηδένα δύνασθαι φυλάξαι αὐτά. P. 227, B. And in his Apol. Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. P. 98, A. Vid. et p. 61, D. et 62. &c.

<sup>q</sup> P. 98, C. fin.

Gospels in particular, he explains himself thus: "The apostles, in those commentaries of theirs which "are called Gospels<sup>r</sup>." He very frequently cites Luke's Gospel, in many places under the general name of the commentaries of the apostles<sup>s</sup>; and once in this manner: "In those commentaries which "were composed by his apostles, and those who followed them<sup>t</sup>." The last words are those made use of by St. Luke in the preface to his Gospel, which we translate, *having a perfect understanding in all things*<sup>u</sup>. But Justin Martyr and Eusebius understood it of his having followed the apostles<sup>x</sup>. Justin Martyr has also a plain allusion to several passages in the Acts of the Apostles<sup>y</sup>, though none are expressly cited by him in that part of his works which are come to us.

We have very few Christian writers elder than Justin, that have reached our time; and what we

<sup>r</sup> What may confirm this is, that in proving our Lord foretold there should many false professors arise, he not only quotes passages from the Gospels, but alludes to that of St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19.

<sup>s</sup> Apol. p. 75, B. Dial. p. 327, B. 328, C. 331, B. 332, B. 333, C. Vid. p. 235, D.

<sup>t</sup> Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῖς φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνους παρακολουθησάντων συνετάχθαι. Dial. p. 331, D.

<sup>u</sup> Ἐδοξε καὶ μοι παρηκολουθήκоти ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς. Luc. i. 3.

<sup>x</sup> Οἷς (ἀπαρχῆς αὐτόπταις καὶ ὑπηρέταις τοῦ λόγου) καὶ φησὶν ἐπὶ ἀνῶθεν ἅπασιν παρηκολουθήκονται. E. H. l. 3. c. 4. p. 58, fin.

<sup>y</sup> Apol. p. 86, B. compared with Luc. xxiv. 49. Acts i. 4. 8. and ii. 1, &c. p. 78, A. compared with Acts i. 4. 8. 26. and iv. 13. p. 76, D. 85, A. and 88, C. compared with Acts xiii. 27, 28. p. 91, A. compared with Acts viii. 9, 10, 11. p. 61, B. compared with Acts xix. 18, 19. Χρημάτων δὲ καὶ κτημάτων οἱ πόρους παντὸς μᾶλλον στέργοντες, νῦν καὶ ἃ ἔχομεν εἰς κοινὸν φέροντες, καὶ παντὶ δεομένῳ κοινωνοῦντες, p. 61, B. compared with Acts ii. 44, 45.

have of their works are generally but occasional Epistles, in which it could not be expected that they should say much of the writings of the New Testament. However, there are plain allusions to the Acts of the Apostles in some of them, as particularly in the few fragments we have of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, preserved by Eusebius<sup>z</sup>, in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians<sup>a</sup>, in one of the Epistles of Ignatius<sup>b</sup>, in St. Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians<sup>c</sup>, and in the Epistle of Barnabas<sup>d</sup>.

We learn also from the heresies broached in those early times, that the books of the New Testament were held sacred in the churches of Christ from the beginning. Basilides, who published his heresy soon after the apostle John's death, wrote twenty-four books upon the Gospel<sup>e</sup>. Valentine, Carpocrates, and other Gnostics, who flourished presently after in the emperor Adrian's time, received and acknowledged all the books of the New Testament as sacred and divine, though, by their mystical interpretation of certain passages in them, they made the vilest use of them imaginable. They founded their doctrines chiefly on some passages in St. Luke's Gospel. Cerdo and Marcion, who could not reconcile their notions with the writings of the New Testament, boldly rejected a great part of them; but

<sup>z</sup> E. H. l. 3. c. 39. p. 90. compared with xxi. 9. and i. 23, 24.

<sup>a</sup> §. 1. compared with Acts ii. 24.

<sup>b</sup> Ad Eph. §. 12. compared with Acts xix. 18. and xx. 24, 25.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Ep. §. 42. n. 10. compared with Acts xiv. 23. and xx. 28.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. pr. compared with Acts x. 42.

<sup>d</sup> §. 7, fin. compared with Acts xiv. 22.

<sup>e</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 7. p. 97, A. fin.

this very Marcion had before received and owned them<sup>f</sup>. He published his Heresy very early. It is certain it was greatly spread before Justin Martyr offered his first Apology to the emperor. This is a clear proof that the Acts of the Apostles was received by all, both Christians and heretics, at the beginning of the second century : and how easy was it to look back from thence to the publishing it, which probably was some time between the years of Christ 63 and 69 !

<sup>f</sup> Tertull. de Carne Christi, p. 308, B.

## CHAP. XVI.

*A brief recapitulation of the things said in the last chapter, together with the evidence thence arising of the truth and certainty of the principal matters related in the History of the Acts.*

I HAVE laid before you the clear proofs there are that St. Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles. I have also shewn you that it was received by the Christians of the first ages as a sacred book. It brings down St. Paul's History to the year of Christ 63; but proceeding no further, we thence conclude that it was written between that year and the year 69, when St. Paul was beheaded. For had it been published after his death, it is reasonable to think that the historian would have given us an account of the rest of St. Paul's travels, and of his martyrdom.

It was a thing so notorious, that the Gospel according to St. Luke was published during the lives of the apostles, and many years before the destruction of Jerusalem, that the enemies of Christianity could not deny it. Origen, to shew the prescience of our Saviour, instances in what he foretold concerning Jerusalem; and then adds, "For certainly they will not say that the apostles, and other immediate followers of Jesus himself, delivered down the doctrine of the Gospels without writing, and left their disciples without written commentaries of those things which relate to Jesus. Now it is written in them, *And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the*

“*desolation thereof is nigh*<sup>a</sup>. There were at that time no armies encompassing Jerusalem and laying siege to it. For this began in the reign of the emperor Nero, and continued to the government of Vespasian, whose son Titus destroyed Jerusalem<sup>b</sup>.” The passage quoted from the Commentaries of Christ’s disciples is to be found only in the Gospel according to St. Luke. And it is very evident that he understood it to be a thing well known, a thing that could not be disputed by Celsus, or any other enemy of the Christian religion, that several of the Gospels, and that of St. Luke in particular, was published before the reign of Nero. And some years before the conclusion of that reign probably was published *δεύτερος λόγος*, or the second part, entitled, The Acts of the Apostles.

It is the opinion of some very learned men, that the first Epistle of Clemens Romanus was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, because it speaks of the temple as then standing, and of the sacrifices and services as at that time performed<sup>c</sup>. And in one paragraph of that Epistle have we what may be called a brief epitome of the Acts of the Apostles; which, according to the translation of our late learned archbishop, is thus: “The apostles having received their command, and being thoroughly as-

<sup>a</sup> Luke xxi. 20.

<sup>b</sup> Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοὺς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ γνωρίμους καὶ ἀκρεατὰς φήσουσι χωρὶς γραφῆς τὴν τῶν εὐαγγελίων παραδεδωκέναι διδασκαλίαν, καὶ καταλιπεῖν τοὺς μαθητὰς χωρὶς τῶν περὶ Ἰησοῦ ἐν γράμμασιν ὑπομνημάτων γέγραπτα. δὴ ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ, “Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε κυκλομένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, τότε γινώτε ὅτι ἤγγισεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς” καὶ οὐδαμῶς τότε ἦν στρατόπεδα περὶ τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ κυκλοῦντα αὐτὴν, καὶ περιέχοντα, καὶ πολιορκοῦντα· τοῦτο γὰρ ἤρξατο μὲν ἔτι Νέρωνος βασιλεύοντος, κ. τ. λ. Adv. Cels. l. 2. p. 69. l. 8.

<sup>c</sup> §. 41.



“sured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ,  
 “and convinced by the word of God, with the ful-  
 “ness of the Holy Spirit, they went abroad publish-  
 “ing, *that the kingdom of God was at hand*. And  
 “thus preaching through countries and cities, they  
 “appointed the firstfruits of their conversions to be  
 “bishops and deacons over such as should after-  
 “wards believe, having first proved them by the  
 “Spirit<sup>d</sup>.” In his Second Epistle also is there a  
 manifest allusion to an expression in the Acts of the  
 Apostles<sup>e</sup>.

That Clemens firmly believed the inspiration of  
 the books of the Old Testament, is evident from his  
 own express words. For he exhorts the Corinthians  
 thus: “Look into the holy scriptures, which are the  
 “true words of the Holy Ghost<sup>f</sup>.” And that he  
 believed the same of the writings of the New Tes-  
 tament, is no less evident, so far as his subject led  
 him to speak of them. For, mentioning the Epistle  
 of St. Paul to the Corinthians, he says, “In truth  
 “he wrote an Epistle to you by the Spirit concern-  
 “ing himself, and Cephas, and Apollos<sup>g</sup>.” And  
 doubtless he had said the same thing of the other  
 books, if he had had the same occasion particularly  
 to name them. Agreeably hereto, in his Second  
 Epistle, having quoted the prophecy of Isaiah, he  
 immediately adds, “And another scripture saith,”

<sup>d</sup> §. 42. Let this passage be compared with Acts xiv. 23. and  
 xx. 28. And in what other History is the institution of deacons  
 related but in the Acts of the Apostles?

<sup>e</sup> §. 1, pr. compared with Acts x. 42. Κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Ep. §. 45.

<sup>g</sup> 'Επ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ τε, καὶ Κηφᾶ,  
 καὶ Ἀπολλῶ. 1 Ep. §. 47.

citing words from St. Matthew's Gospel<sup>h</sup>. And he more than once introduces the words of St. Luke's Gospel as the sayings of our Lord<sup>i</sup>.

Ignatius, who had been bishop of Antioch forty years<sup>k</sup>, and suffered martyrdom in the year of Christ 107 or 110, or at the latest 116, distinguishes the writings of the New Testament into the Gospel and the Apostles, (as we have before observed is done by Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius,) and professes the very highest regard for them. His words are these: "Your prayer to God shall make me perfect, that I may attain to that portion which by God's mercy is allotted to me; fleeing to the gospel as to the flesh of Christ, and to the apostles as to the presbytery of the church. We also love the prophets, because they have preached to us the things pertaining to the gospel, and have hoped in Christ, and waited for him: in whom also believing, they were saved<sup>l</sup>." His first and principal regard was

<sup>h</sup> §. 2.

<sup>i</sup> 1 Ep. §. 13, 46. 2 Ep. §. 4, fin. 5. 6. 8.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Cave, Basnage, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Ep. ad Philad. §. 5. That this passage is to be understood of the scriptures, vid. Clerici Not. in loc. How could either the Gospel or the Apostles be spoken of as his refuge, or be a support and comfort to him under his present great sufferings, and approaching martyrdom, if not expressed in writing, if not present to his view? The Prophets, we know, were in writing, and by them he undoubtedly means the whole Old Testament, consequently by the Gospel and Apostles the New. And that he had a written Gospel in view is very plain from other parallel places in his Epistles. He exhorts the Smyrnæans to avoid all conversation with the heretics, and to apply their minds and attend to the Prophets, but especially to the Gospel, Προσέχειν δὲ τοῖς προφήταις, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, in which both Christ's passion is manifested to us, and his resurrection perfectly declared, §. 7.

to the scriptures of the New Testament, and then to those of the Old, (expressed here by the prophets,) as confirming the former. He made the writings of the New Testament his refuge, fleeing to them for instruction, support, and comfort; esteeming the gospel as the sayings of Christ, and giving the same credit to what is therein related, as he would have done to our Lord himself when in the flesh; esteeming the other writings of the New Testament as the presbytery of the church, or those officers who were commissioned by our Saviour to instruct the whole Christian church in matters of faith and practice, that is, giving them the same credit as to the apostles themselves when alive. I have already shewn you from Tertullian, that when the scriptures of the New Testament are divided into the Gospel and Apostles, the Acts of the Apostles is included in the latter<sup>m</sup>. And in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians there is a manifest allusion to that part of the History of the Acts which relates St. Paul's abode at Ephesus, and his sending for the Ephesian elders to take his final farewell of them<sup>n</sup>. And in the Acts of Ignatius's Martyrdom, written by some of those who accompanied him to Rome, it is said, "that when he was shewn Puteoli, he hast-

And in the same Epistle, speaking of the heretics, he says, "whom neither the Prophecies nor the Law of Moses have persuaded, no, nor even the Gospel to this day." §. 5. Vid. Epist. ad Philad. §. 8, 9. That which renders this interpretation the more certain is, that Irenæus, who flourished in the middle of the same century, speaking of the Valentinians, says, *Οὐ μόνον ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πειρῶνται τὰς ἀποδείξεις ποιεῖσθαι—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν*. L. I. c. 3. §. 6. p. 17.

<sup>m</sup> P. 509.

<sup>n</sup> §. 12. compared with Acts xix. and xx. 17, &c.

“ened to go out of the ship, being desirous to tread in the steps of the apostle Paul;” most plainly alluding to St. Paul’s landing there, as is related in the Acts of the Apostles<sup>o</sup>.

Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, in that short Epistle which he wrote to the Philippians about the time of Ignatius’s martyrdom, says, “I trust that ye are well exercised in the holy scriptures;” and then quotes as such a passage from the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians<sup>p</sup>. He also plainly alludes to the history of St. Paul’s preaching to, and converting the Philippians<sup>q</sup>: and makes use of a sentence spoken by St. Peter, related Acts ii. 24. *Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death*<sup>r</sup>.

Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who lived at the same time, and was intimately acquainted with Polycarp<sup>s</sup>, wrote five books, entitled, The Exposition of our Lord’s Oracles. There are but a very few fragments of these preserved, and even in these small remains the Acts of the Apostles is either expressly quoted, or most plainly referred to<sup>t</sup>.

There is no room to doubt but that they who first broached their heresies in the reigns of the emperors

<sup>o</sup> §. 10. compared with Acts xxviii. 13, 14.

<sup>p</sup> Confido enim vos bene exercitatos esse in sacris literis; et nihil vos latet: mihi autem non est concessum modo. Ut his scripturis dictum est, *Irascimini et nolite peccare*: et, *Sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram*, §. 12. Compare Eph. iv. 26.

<sup>q</sup> §. 3. compared with Acts xvi. 12, &c. Vid. et §. 11.

<sup>r</sup> <sup>o</sup>Ον ἤγειρεν ὁ Θεὸς, λύσας τὰς ἀδύνας τοῦ θανάτου. §. 1.

<sup>s</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 3. c. 36, pr. et 39, pr.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. p. 90, B. It is not clear to me whether the citation be made by Eusebius or by Papias. If by Eusebius, he had reason doubtless to make that application from the words of Papias.

Trajan and Hadrian, such as Saturninus, Basilides <sup>u</sup>, Carpocrates <sup>x</sup>, and Valentine, received and acknowledged the Acts of the Apostles, as well as the Gospels and the Epistles. Tertullian expressly asserts of Valentine, that he made use of the entire Instrument <sup>y</sup>, that is, of all the books of the New Testament, which were at that time received by the churches, of which it is most certain that Tertullian esteemed the Acts of the Apostles to be one. Valentine must have published his Heresy early in the reign of Hadrian, if not before: for during the reign of that emperor Justin Martyr wrote against his heresy <sup>z</sup>. It is not at all improbable that he spent part of his time during the life of the apostle John <sup>a</sup>. However, it is very plain from the pretensions of his followers that he was contemporary with the immediate disciples of the apostles: for they gave out that he received his doctrine from Theodas the scholar of the apostle Paul, in the same manner as it was said of Basilides, that he had been the hearer of Glaucias the interpreter of the apostle Peter <sup>b</sup>.

Cerdo and Marcion, it is true, rejected three of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles; but Tertullian assures us, that it appeared by an Epistle

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Massuet. Dissert. Præv. in Iren. p. 58—61.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Iren. l. 1. c. 25. §. 4.

<sup>y</sup> De Præscript. Hæret. c. 38. p. 216, B. Vid. et Iren. l. 1. c. 3. §. 6. et c. 8. et 9.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Tertull. adv. Valentin. c. 5. p. 252, B. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 253. Apol. p. 70. Massuet. Dissert. Præv. in Iren. p. 15. n. 6.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Grabe, Spicil. vol. 2. p. 46. et Massuet. Dissert. Præv. p. 16, pr.

<sup>b</sup> Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7. c. 17. p. 898. l. 10.

under Marcion's own hand, that before he published his heresy he acknowledged those books<sup>c</sup>. Marcion had published his heresy in a great part of the world before Justin Martyr presented his first Apology to the emperor Antoninus Pius<sup>d</sup>, which it is thought he did in the year of Christ 139 or 145<sup>e</sup>. It is very evident therefore that the Acts of the Apostles was a book received and acknowledged by the churches long before that time. And indeed it is a constant, unanimous assertion of the ancients, and what they use as an irrefragable argument against those heretics who rejected or corrupted part of the sacred writings, that the scriptures of the New Testament were more ancient than the heretics themselves, and were in the apostolic churches long before they published their heresies<sup>f</sup>. I have already quoted a long passage from Tertullian to this purpose<sup>g</sup>: in another place, having cited a passage from the Gospel of St. Luke, left out, I suppose, in that of Marcion, he adds, "Thus is it contained in the Gospel published before Marcion<sup>h</sup>."

It appears to me nothing less than a demonstration, that the books of the New Testament, at the beginning of the second century, had been long received by the churches as sacred, and held in the

<sup>c</sup> Adv. Marcion. l. 1. c. 1. p. 366, B. De Carne Christi, c. 2. p. 308, B. De Præscript. Hæret. c. 30. p. 212, B.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Apol. p. 70, A. et p. 92, A.

<sup>e</sup> See Massuet. Dissert. Præv. in Iren. p. 15.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Iren. l. 3. c. 21. §. 3, fin. l. 5. c. 20. §. 1, 2. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7. §. 17. p. 897, 898. Tertull. de Præscript. Hæret. c. 29, 30, &c.

<sup>g</sup> Adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 5. p. 415, 416.

<sup>h</sup> De Carne Christi, c. 7. p. 313, A.



highest esteem by all Christians, because that most of the heretics which arose about that time pretended to acknowledge those books, and to found their doctrines upon what was written therein<sup>i</sup>; and others of them forged books under the same names, such as Gospels and Acts<sup>k</sup>. What occasion had they to do either the one or the other of these things, or how is there any accounting for their taking these measures, had not the books of the New Testament been now of a long, undoubted, and established credit? In the same place that Tertullian informs us of Valentine's using the New Testament entire, he also tells us how vilely he wrested the words of it to bring them to his purpose. And Irenæus furnishes us with many examples of that kind. Heraclæon, a disciple of Valentine, wrote Commentaries, such as they were, upon the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, frequently taken notice of and confuted by the learned Origen in his Commentaries<sup>l</sup>.

Justin Martyr, in those remains of his which are come down to us, has several manifest allusions to the Acts of the Apostles, and without doubt includes them under the name of the Commentaries of the Apostles, which, as he informs the emperor in his

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Iren. l. 1. c. 1. §. 3. fin. et c. 3. §. 6. et c. 8. l. 2. c. 10. §. 1, 2. et c. 20. §. 1, 2. l. 4. c. 35. §. 4.

<sup>k</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 3. c. 25. p. 78, C. Iren. l. 3. c. 11. §. 9. c. 2. Epiph. Hær. 30. §. 16.

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Grab. Spicil. vol. 2. p. 83, &c. And agreeably hereto, Peregrinus, who turned Christian probably under Trajan, and continued so during a great part of Hadrian's reign, is represented by Lucian as becoming very eminent among the Christians, expounding some of their books, and composing many others. Καὶ τῶν βιβλῶν τὰς μὲν ἐξηγεῖτο, καὶ διεσάφει· πολλὰς δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ξυνέγραφε. De Morte Peregr. vol. 2. p. 762, B. C.

Apology, were read in the Christian assemblies on Sundays<sup>m</sup>.

Irenæus puts the Acts of the Apostles upon the same footing with the Gospel, which, he says, was committed to writing, that it might be the pillar and foundation of our faith. He gives us a brief account of the authors of the four Gospels, and the time when they wrote them; and tells us, that Luke, the follower of the apostle Paul, who wrote the Gospel, wrote also the Acts of the Apostles. And, forasmuch as the apostles were elder than all the heretics, he appeals to their writings, and the writings of their followers, that is, as he himself explains it, of Mark and Luke, in order to confute them<sup>n</sup>. And had not he the certain means of knowing these things? It was but in the year of Christ 177 that he was made bishop of Lyons: probably he was well advanced in years before that time. However, he had been presbyter in the same church under Pothinus, who suffered martyrdom when he was above ninety years of age. He had also in his younger days been under the instruction of Polycarp, who was ordained bishop of Smyrna by the apostles themselves, and had conversed familiarly with the apostle John many years. He speaks like-

<sup>m</sup> The Acts of the Apostles is named by Tertullian *Commentarius Lucæ*. De Jej. c. 10. p. 549, B.

<sup>n</sup> Etenim apostoli, cum sint his omnibus vetustiores, consonant prædictæ interpretationi, (i. e. LXX.) et interpretatio consonat apostolorum traditioni. Etenim Petrus, et Joannes, et Matthæus, et Paulus, et reliqui deinceps, et horum sectatores, prophetica omnia ita annuntiaverunt, quemadmodum seniorum interpretatio continet. L. 3. c. 21. §. 3, fin. Let this be compared with cap. 1. §. 1.

wise of other ancient Christians, who had conversed with the apostles, and their immediate disciples, as persons of his acquaintance. It is most certain therefore he could not but well know what regard was paid by the Christian church to the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles from the very beginning.

I have also shewn you that Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and Eusebius, esteemed the Acts of the Apostles a sacred book ; and that Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius fully declare that it was always so esteemed in the churches of Christ from the beginning.

I now proceed to lay before you the arguments hence arising for the truth of the facts related in this History. The facts related are of so uncommon a nature, and so circumstantially told, that it is not possible to conceive this book should ever have been held sacred, had they not been most notoriously true. Could we suppose the Christians so unwise to receive such a book, and read it in their assemblies, although the facts contained in it were not true ; what end could it possibly serve but to ruin their cause ? Would not their new converts startle at the hearing from time to time rehearsed things of so strange a nature, which they could not but know were entirely groundless ? Would not this drive them away from their assemblies, give them a bad impression of Christianity, and make them wholly averse to it ? Would they not also publish the reason of their conduct, and prevent others from embracing a religion which had consecrated so many untruths ? Or if we can imagine that Christians could sit easy and contented under the hearing of so many falsehoods, were not the enemies of Chris-

tianity always upon the watch to take every advantage against them? Must not this book have soon fallen into the hands of some of them? And would not they have exposed the falsehood of what is related to the whole world, and so have put a stop to the progress of the Christian religion?

A particular consideration of some of the facts themselves will explain and clear this matter to you. The miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost; the cure of the lame man that sat at the Beautiful gate of the temple; the death of Ananias and Sapphira; and the many miracles wrought by the apostles in Jerusalem<sup>o</sup>; insomuch that it is said, *they brought the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them. And that there came also a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem, bringing sick folks, and them which were vexed with unclean spirits: and they were healed every one*; these are things of so extraordinary a nature, that, if true, must easily have been confirmed many years after they happened. For certainly they must make a deep and lasting impression on the memories of all who were eyewitnesses, much more on those who were actually healed, as well as on all those who were related to them, and had any real concern for their welfare. If therefore there were not many persons to be found fifty or sixty years after these things are said to have happened, who could give testimony to their truth, no doubt they must have been looked upon as absolute falsehoods.

<sup>o</sup> Acts v. 12, &c. vi. 8.

In like manner the miracles done in the city of Samaria, where it is said, *that many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed*<sup>p</sup>, at the sight of which even Simon the sorcerer became a convert, and the conferring the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost by laying on the hands of the apostles<sup>q</sup>, were things which must necessarily have admitted an easy and clear proof fifty or sixty years after they happened, if true. For if the persons themselves who were healed did not live so long, yet doubtless many of their relations and acquaintance must: and if the persons who at that time received the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit did not continue so long in life, yet doubtless many who were eyewitnesses of their exercising them, and some who had been cured of distempers, or freed from evil spirits by them, must.

And should we advance one step further, and admit of proof by hearsay, no doubt but the knowledge of these things must have been continued down by immediate tradition as many years longer. For such wonderful events could not but create much discourse, and must have been long talked of. And without all doubt there must have been many persons living a hundred years after these facts are said to have been performed who received a relation of them, either from those who had been eyewitnesses of the fact, or at least had conversed with the persons themselves who had been healed. And indeed if there were not many persons to be found a hundred years after these things are said to have happened who had been fully informed of them from good and authentic hands, it would have been taken

<sup>p</sup> Acts viii. 6, 7.

<sup>q</sup> Acts viii. 17.

for granted by all wise men that there was no truth in them.

The bitter persecution carried on by Saul, and his miraculous conversion<sup>r</sup>, are represented as facts of so notorious a nature, that, if true, there must have remained good evidence of their truth many years after. Likewise Peter's healing Æneas, who had been bedrid with the palsy eight years<sup>s</sup>; and his raising Dorcas from the dead at Joppa<sup>t</sup>. It is expressly said of Æneas, that *all who dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw him after he was healed*. And of the latter fact, that *it was known throughout all Joppa*. If there remained no remembrance of things so remarkable as these, when this book first came among the Christians in that part of Judæa, can it be thought they would have received it, and held it as sacred?

The conversion of Cornelius and his family by the apostle Peter is represented as having been immediately known to the Jewish Christians, who were highly offended at it, and called Peter to a strict account for having preached the gospel to a heathen<sup>u</sup>. Cæsarea was the seat of the Roman governor, and Cornelius a centurion in the Roman army. Would the Christian church at Cæsarea have received a book giving such a relation, had there not remained in that city sufficient evidence of the fact? Herod Agrippa's imprisonment of the apostle Peter, and the apostle's miraculous deliverance out of prison, together with the execution of the keepers, were things of the most public nature, and that could not but be long remembered<sup>x</sup>.

<sup>r</sup> Acts ix.

<sup>s</sup> Acts ix. 32.

<sup>t</sup> Acts ix. 36.

<sup>u</sup> Acts xi.

<sup>x</sup> Acts xii.



But, leaving Judæa and Syria, let us accompany the apostle Paul in his travels thence into the western part of the world. When he came to Paphos in Cyprus, it is said that he struck Elymas the sorcerer blind, and thereby so opened the eyes of Sergius Paulus the Roman proconsul, that he became a convert to the Christian religion<sup>y</sup>. This is a thing which, if true, must have been immediately known throughout the whole island: and the impression it must have made on men's minds must have been durable; so that a firm and credible tradition of it must have remained there many years. And if sixty, or indeed a hundred years after, there appeared no footsteps of such a tradition, who would have believed the fact? who would have given encouragement to a book relating such a fact? Is it credible that the Christian churches in Cyprus, and there were not a few even from the times of the apostles, would hold such a book as sacred, had there not been undeniable evidence of the truth of what it relates, as having happened in their own island?

It is said of Paul and Barnabas, when they came to Iconium, that they *abode there a long time, speaking boldly in the Lord, which gave testimony unto the word of his grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands*<sup>z</sup>. And when they were come to Lystra in Lycaonia, it is said, Paul healed a man lame from his mother's womb, which occasioned so great admiration, that the people of the city thought the gods had visited them in the likeness of men, and took Barnabas for Jupiter, and Paul for Mercury. And the priest of Jupiter brought

<sup>y</sup> Acts xiii. 6, &c.<sup>z</sup> Acts xiv. 3.

oxen and garlands to the gates of the house where they lodged, in order to have done sacrifice to them; and it was with no small difficulty they were prevented. Howbeit afterwards, by the persuasion of the Jews who came from Antioch and Iconium, they so far changed their opinion, that they stoned Paul, and drew him out of their city, leaving him for dead: that notwithstanding, when the multitude was dispersed, he rose up unhurt, and returned into the city<sup>a</sup>. Could any thing be more open and public than this is related to have been? Must it not, if true, have been well known to every person in Lystra? Could any events strike them deeper, or make a more lasting impression on their minds; especially on those of the younger people? Must there not have been living evidence of these facts very many years after? And is it possible that a book relating these facts could gain any credit at Lystra, had not their truth been most notorious? Or is it conceivable, that the Christian churches in Antioch, in Iconium, in Derbe, (for from the relation it is evident that these cities also must have been well apprised of the same facts,) any more than in Lystra, would have held this book sacred? And as to Iconium, I have already observed, it is expressly said, miraculous works were performed there.

Let us next pass on to Philippi in Macedonia: how surprising are the events, how extraordinary the circumstances, which are said to have happened in that city! The conversion of Lydia: the casting out the spirit of divination: the tumult raised by

<sup>a</sup> Acts xiv. 8, &c.

the masters of the damsel: the rashness and severity of the magistrates: the imprisonment of Paul and Silas: the miraculous opening the prison doors without one prisoner's making his escape: the conversion of the gaoler: the remorse of the magistrates for what they had done, and their honourable dismissal of Paul and Silas<sup>b</sup>. If these things were so, must they not have been notoriously known, not only to every person in Philippi, but in the country and towns round about? And for many years after must there not have been found the clearest evidence of these facts, not only in the gaoler's family, but many other families of the city of Philippi?

Did the Christian church in that city receive the Acts of the Apostles as a sacred book, or did they not? If any credit may be given to the writings of the ancients, it is a certain fact that they did. But is it possible to conceive they should, had it not been well known that the events related therein, as having fallen out in that city, were true? What otherwise could they propose to themselves in so doing? Must it not have put an entire stop to the progress of Christianity both there and in all the country round it? For when converts came to perceive that such notorious lies were received for sacred truths, would they have remained Christians? and that under all the disadvantages which Christians at that time suffered? Would they endure the loss of all things, and even hazard their lives, when they found themselves so strangely imposed upon? Is it at all probable? is it like human nature?

It was about the year of Christ 51 or 52 that St.

<sup>b</sup> Acts xvi. 14, &c.

Paul was at Philippi: and it was but twelve or thirteen years after these things are said to have happened that the History of the Acts was published. It is highly probable therefore that this book was received by the Christian church in that city when all things were recent, and in every one's memory. But should we suppose, for argument's sake, that it was not received by them till sixty or seventy years after the events related are said to have fallen out: at which time it is abundantly evident that it was in the hands of all, both Christians and heretics, and held by them as sacred, and indeed had for a long time been esteemed so: how easy was it to look back, and examine the truth? If there were no persons living who were eyewitnesses of the facts, (of whom, if true, it is probable there must have been some,) there must however have been hundreds that had received an account thereof from those who were eyewitnesses. And if the converts to Christianity did not find a plain, clear, and full tradition in that city, and the country round about, that these things were so, must they not have concluded that they were imposed upon?

It is related of St. Paul afterwards, that he preached at Thessalonica, Berœa, and Athens<sup>c</sup>. Must not the Christian churches in those cities well know whether St. Paul was their founder? It is said, that at Thessalonica there was a tumult raised, and an assault made upon the house of one Jason, because he had received the apostle; and that they drew Jason and other Christians before the magistrates of the city, who took security of them<sup>d</sup>. Must

<sup>c</sup> Acts xvii.

<sup>d</sup> Ver. 5—9.

not these things have been well known? Must it not have appeared even in the records of the city itself whether the magistrates took security of Jason and his friends? Must not St. Paul's preaching at Areopagus have been a thing most public? And must it not be well known, if a person of such eminence as Dionysius the Areopagite became his convert<sup>e</sup>?

St. Paul's stay at Corinth is represented as considerable; that he lodged in the house of one Justus adjoining to the synagogue; and that Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue became his convert with all his family; and that many of the Corinthians believed and were baptized, so that he had there a very large harvest; that the Jews made an insurrection, and brought him before Gallio the proconsul of Achaia; and that Sosthenes the chief ruler of the synagogue was beaten openly in the presence<sup>f</sup> of the judge. It was but ten or eleven years after these things are said to have happened that the Acts of the Apostles were published. If true therefore, these things must have been fresh in every one's mind when this book first came to Corinth; and if false, must have been most easily confuted. The apostle in his Epistles to the church of Corinth acknowledges that Crispus was baptized by him, and Sosthenes joins with him in writing the First Epistle. He says also, that signs and wonders and mighty deeds were wrought amongst them<sup>g</sup>, and that the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit were conferred on and divided among them<sup>h</sup>. These

<sup>e</sup> Ver. 19. 22, &c.

<sup>f</sup> Acts xviii.

<sup>g</sup> 2 Cor. xii. 12.

<sup>h</sup> 1 Cor. xii. and xiv. 26, &c.

Epistles were written not above three years after he is represented in the Acts as having lived with them, and founded their church. Is it possible to think that they would have received his Epistles, and held them as sacred, had they not well known things to have been as he there represents them? The first of these Epistles is expressly mentioned and referred to by Clemens Romanus in his first Epistle to the same church<sup>i</sup>, written before the destruction of Jerusalem<sup>k</sup>, and soon after the Acts of the Apostles were published, or, as some think, in the reign of Domitian, and a few years before the close of the first century<sup>l</sup>.

At Ephesus St. Paul is represented as having conferred the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit on twelve men that had known only the baptism of John. It is said that he disputed in the synagogue three months, and in the school of Tyrannus two years, so that all the people dwelling in the district of Asia round about heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks; and that God wrought special miracles by his hands, so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them; that seven sons of one Sceva a Jew, and chief of the priests, attempting to cast out an evil spirit in the name of Jesus, whom Paul preached, the man, in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them, and overcame them, so that they fled out of the house naked and wounded. And it is expressly added, that *this was known to all the*

<sup>i</sup> §. 47, pr.

<sup>k</sup> See Wake's Discourse, §. 15, 16, 17.

<sup>l</sup> Cotelierius.



*Jews and Greeks also dwelling at Ephesus.* Many also, who used magical arts, becoming converts to the Christian religion, burnt their books, which were of a considerable value, publicly before all men. After this a tumult, being raised by Demetrius and his craftsmen against Paul, was with difficulty suppressed by the townclerk <sup>m</sup>.

Ephesus was one of the most noted cities in Asia Minor <sup>n</sup>, large and populous, had a good port, and a great trade. The things related are spoken as publicly done, and known to all. They were also of such a nature as must necessarily excite men's curiosity and attention, beget much talk, and spread themselves wide. And they fell out not above seven or eight years before the Acts of the Apostles was published. Is it possible to conceive, that the Christian church at Ephesus could receive a book relating such events, had they not been well known facts? It is a thing with me beyond doubt, that the Acts of the Apostles was no sooner written than it was dispersed throughout the churches. There is not so much as a shadow of a reason to be offered against this, and many strong reasons to incline us to believe it. And if the church of Ephesus received this book within eight years after these things are said to have happened, is not the consequence obvious? Must it not have put an entire stop to Christianity in all that country, had not the facts related been most notoriously true, and known to all? But should we, to allow scope for argument,

<sup>m</sup> Acts xix.

<sup>n</sup> The proconsul of Asia was obliged to go to his province by sea, and to put in first at the metropolis of Ephesus, l. 4. §. 5. ff. de Offic. Proc.

suppose it was sixty years after the event before this book was brought to that church, and received by them as sacred; and we well know, that before that time it was in the hands of both Christians and heretics, and of established authority as a sacred book; if these events were true, must there not have been many persons living at that time who remembered them? What! not many persons who could look back sixty years in so large a city as that of Ephesus? Possibly there might be some living whom Paul healed: but if there were not, it is most certain there must have been many, very many, who knew them, and conversed with them. Could things of so strange and surprising a nature be so soon forgot? If there remained no footsteps of them in so short a time after, is it to be thought there could be found many persons who would give credit to them, and this when it was so contrary to their interests, when they were exposed to so many hardships, and even to the hazard of their lives, for professing themselves Christians?

St. Paul's raising Eutychus at Troas<sup>o</sup> must have been a thing well known to the Christians there; otherwise would they have received this book? His appeal to Cæsar, his being sent to Rome, his shipwreck at Melita, his being unhurt by the viper which had fastened on him, his healing the father of Publius, the chief man of the island, of a bloody flux, and his curing others which had diseases in the island<sup>p</sup>, were things all of them public, and some of them very surprising, and happened but about three years before the Acts of the Apostles

<sup>o</sup> Acts xx. 9—12.

<sup>p</sup> Acts xxvii. and xxviii.

was published. Would the Christians in Melita have received such a book, had not these facts been well known to them?

It is further said, that St. Paul having been brought a prisoner to Rome, continued there two years preaching the gospel in his own hired house<sup>9</sup>. The Christians at Rome had opportunity also of informing themselves in most of the great events related in the History of the Acts: for that, being the seat of the empire, was the centre to which persons flocked from all parts of the world. And it was easy to inquire of those who came from Judæa, from Philippi, from Thessalonica, from Corinth, from Ephesus, from Troas, from Melita, what truth there was in the things that are said to have happened in those places. And had they not been fully convinced of their truth, would they have held this book as sacred?

The sum of the evidence is this: The Acts of the Apostles, containing an history of thirty years, was published soon after the time in which it ends. Irenæus tells us the Gospel of St. Luke was published after the departure of Peter and Paul. Most understand hereby, after their decease: others, I think, with more reason, understand it of their departure from the city of Rome, i. e. about the year of Christ 63, at which time the History of the Acts ends; and very probably it was soon after, or about the year of Christ 64, that Luke published the Acts of the Apostles. Otherwise we might reasonably expect that it should have proceeded further with the account of St. Paul's travels.

<sup>9</sup> Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

This History giving a clear and distinct narration of the wonderful descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and the amazing effects thereof; the planting of Christian churches in Judæa, Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, and other parts, together with the miraculous means made use of to accomplish it, naming places, persons, circumstances, sometimes persons of the highest rank in the greatest and most populous cities; and being received by those very churches, whose history it relates, whilst all things were yet fresh in every one's memory, had not the facts contained therein been most notoriously true, must certainly have put an entire stop to the progress of Christianity, and in a short time have wholly ruined it. For is it to be thought, that persons newly converted could with any patience bear that a book full of the most palpable falsehoods should be held sacred, and read in their assemblies? It is not easy to suppose that any Christians should receive such a book. What end could it serve? But certainly, when new converts came to be let into this secret, it would shock them to a high degree, and give them the greatest aversion to the Christian religion.

Ancient writers agree that this book was unanimously received by the Christian churches from the beginning. The Gospel of St. Luke, which is the former part of this work, is cited by Clemens Romanus<sup>r</sup>, and by Barnabas<sup>s</sup>: and certain passages in the Acts of the Apostles are also alluded to by them, which is a demonstration that it was published about

<sup>r</sup> 1 Epist. §. 13. 17. 2 Ep. §. 4, fin. 6, pr. et 8, fin.

<sup>s</sup> §. 19, prop. fin.

the time I have mentioned, or very soon after. At the beginning of the second century it is most plainly alluded to by Ignatius, by his fellow-travellers and companions, in the account they give of his martyrdom, and by Polycarp, who wrote at latest about the year of Christ 116. And indeed it had been now long esteemed a sacred book, and of established authority. What else could induce the heretics of this time to acknowledge it as such, or to forge other books under the like name<sup>†</sup>?

Should any one, at the time these heresies were first published, have made an inquiry, it was no difficult matter to learn whether the facts related in this book were true or not. Let us suppose one to have looked back so late as from the year of Christ 120, might it not have been known from many then living at Rome, whether St. Paul dwelt at Rome, and preached the gospel in his own hired house, during the years of Christ 62 and 63? Can it be thought, that in so immense a city as Rome was, there were not very great numbers who could look back fifty-seven or fifty-eight years? Might it not also have been known from many then living in the isle of Melita, whether St. Paul had been shipwrecked upon that island, healed the father of Publius the chief man of the island, and many other diseased persons, in the year of Christ 61, that is, fifty-nine years before? Might it not have been

<sup>†</sup> Such as the Acts of Peter, Euseb. E. H. l. 3. c. 3; and the Acts of Andrew, John, and the other apostles. Ibid. l. 3. c. 25. The Acts of Paul seem to have been written, like the Gospel according to the Hebrews, by some uninspired person, containing many truths, and is not reckoned among the heretical. Ibid. c. 3. p. 57, fin. Vid. Grab. Spicileg.

known at Ephesus, whether the wonderful things reported in this book were performed in that city in the years of Christ 56 and 57, that is, sixty-three years before? And might it not have been known at Philippi, whether the things said to have happened there in the year 54, that is, sixty-six years before, so fell out or not? What was more easy than to have confuted these stories, even at that distance of time, had they not been undeniably true?

But let us descend further, to the time of Irenæus, who was made bishop of Lyons in the year of Christ 177. In his works are very many direct and express quotations from the Acts of the Apostles, and an abstract of a large part thereof. He represents this book as equally necessary to be received with the Gospel, and avers the truth of the things which are related in it<sup>u</sup>. And had he not the certain means of knowing whether they were true or not? Unquestionably he had. He had been some time presbyter under Pothinus, who died for the testimony of Jesus at above ninety years of age. Pothinus therefore was born in the year of Christ 86. Might not he, in his younger days, have learnt from innumerable persons the truth of these facts? The churches of Lyons and Vienna joined in writing a letter to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, giving an account of the martyrdom and sufferings of Pothinus, and many of their brethren. And it is evi-

<sup>u</sup> Omnibus his cum adesset Lucas, diligenter conscripsit ea, uti neque mendax, neque elatus deprehendi possit, eo quod omnia hæc constarent, et seniore eum esse omnibus, qui nunc aliud docent, neque ignorare veritatem, l. 3. c. 14. §. 1. Neque Lucam mendacem esse possunt ostendere, veritatem nobis cum omni diligentia annuntiantem, c. 15. §. 1.



dent from this Epistle, that the martyrs and confessors of those two Gallic churches had before their eyes the example of the protomartyr Stephen, as related in the Acts of the Apostles<sup>x</sup>. But would they have had any regard to such an example, had they not been fully persuaded of its truth? Or is it in the least credible, that they should be encouraged to suffer imprisonments, racks, tortures, and the most cruel, lingering, painful deaths, for the sake of the Christian religion, had they not been first fully satisfied that the facts reported in this book, which was held sacred among them, were true?

Irenæus, in his younger days, was under the instruction of Polycarp, ordained bishop of Smyrna by the apostles. Must not Polycarp well know whether the events recorded in the Acts of the Apostles were true or not? He had conversed familiarly, not only with the apostle John, but others also of the apostles. Smyrna was not so far from Ephesus but Polycarp went frequently thither to visit the apostle John, when he resided in that city. Most certainly then he must be well acquainted at least with what is said to have happened there, and with all those occurrences in which the apostle John is represented as having any part. Is it to be thought that he would have suffered martyrdom for the sake of the Christian religion, as it is certain he did, had he not been well assured that the things reported in the Acts of the Apostles were true? Irenæus was also acquainted with other ancient Christians who had conversed with the apostles, from whom he might learn the truth of this History. And when he was

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Euseb. E. H. l. 5. c. 2. p. 135, C.

at Smyrna with Polycarp, how easily might he have gone to Ephesus, and have satisfied himself of the truth of those things which are related to have happened there? Quadratus, in his Apology to the emperor Hadrian, asserts that there were persons living even to his time, who had been healed by our blessed Lord<sup>y</sup>. It is possible there might some live to the time of Irenæus, who had been cured by the apostle Paul at Ephesus. However, it is unquestionable, there must have been many of their acquaintance then living, from whom he might receive a very clear and certain information of the truth of the facts. Though doubtless that which most fully confirmed Irenæus, and the other ancient fathers, in the belief of this History, and left no room for hesitation, were the remains of the same miraculous gifts continued in the church in their time. They saw things of the same wonderful nature performed with their own eyes, as I have already shewn you from their writings.

But to give infidelity the greatest scope possible, let us suppose that the Christians of the first ages were such fools to hold this book as sacred, although they knew the facts contained therein were not true, and that they willingly exposed themselves to the loss of all things, and of life itself, under a pretence of believing these and the like facts, knowing them to be false. It is certain, this is little else than an impossible supposition. However, for argument's sake, let us at present suppose it. What were the enemies of Christianity all this while doing? How came it to pass that they did not publish this to the

<sup>y</sup> Euseb. E. H. l. 4. c. 3.

world, and lay open the knavery and folly of Christians? Was their enmity towards them so little that they would have spared them if they had known this? If so, why did they persecute them, harass them, fine them, imprison them, torture them, and put them to the most cruel deaths? or was this kept a secret from their enemies? But is it likely that a book which was in the hands of so many could be long concealed? Were there no half Christians, no false brethren, to betray such a secret? How many were there from time to time who fell off from the Christian religion! Would none of them discover this book? How many heretics had it in their possession, who professed it as their principle, that they ought not to suffer for their religion! Would none of them shew it? It is a thing indeed next to impossible to suppose that this book was not in the hands of many, both Jews and heathen, within a few years after it was published.

Tertullian in his *Apology* calls upon the Roman powers to look into the books held sacred by the Christians. And at the same time that he says many accidents had put them into the hands of the heathen, he also affirms that it was not the way of the Christians to conceal them <sup>z</sup>. And we very plainly see that Trypho the Jew <sup>a</sup>, and Celsus the Epicurean <sup>b</sup>, had read them: and no doubt many of the enemies of Christianity long before their time had perused

<sup>z</sup> *Inspice Dei voces, literas nostras, quas neque ipsi suppressimus, et plerique casus ad extraneos transferunt.* C. 31, pr. p. 27, C. fin.

<sup>a</sup> *Vid. Just. Mar. Dial. p. 98, a. et 227, B. et 235, D.*

<sup>b</sup> *Vid. Orig. adv. Cels. l. 1. p. 11, pr. l. 2. p. 77. l. 5. p. 273. l. 6. p. 275, 276. 286, m. l. 7. p. 343.*

them. Would not they have confuted the things herein related, when it might have been so easily done, had they not been true? Was not this the sure method to suppress the growth of Christianity, and wholly overthrow it?

But supposing, which is indeed almost an impossible supposition, that no enemy of Christianity had seen the Acts of the Apostles till Trypho and Celsus: might not they have shewn the falsity of the facts related therein, had they not been true? They both lived in the time of the emperor Hadrian; but we will suppose they began not an inquiry into the truth of these things till the beginning of the reign of the emperor Antoninus Pius, or about the year of Christ 137. Might they not at that distance of time have easily satisfied themselves of the truth or falsity hereof? Trypho was both at Corinth and at Ephesus. It was but fourscore years before, that St. Paul is reported to have done his miraculous cures in the city of Ephesus. And should we allow that there were none then living who were St. Paul's converts, or had been cured by him, yet what numbers of their immediate descendants, how many that had seen and conversed with them must there have been living at that time! How strong must have been the tradition of the wonders performed!

In fine, had either Trypho or Celsus, or any other of the enemies of Christianity in their time, made it appear to the world, that, upon a strict scrutiny into the facts related, there was found little or no tradition of them remaining in the places where they are said to have happened, they had done much more to the overthrow of the Christian religion

than by all the other arguments they made use of, or methods they employed. But forasmuch as they did not make this appear, is it not a clear case that they could not, and a convincing proof of the truth of these facts?

## CHAP. XVII.

*The evidence of the truth of Christianity arising from the principal matters related in the History of the Acts.*

I PROCEED now to the fourth general head, and shall lay before you the incontestible evidence these facts afford of the truth of Christianity. The facts are, that Jesus Christ, after a long course of miracles wrought for the benefit of mankind, was put to death at the instigation of the Jewish rulers <sup>a</sup>; that he arose from the dead, was seen of, and conversed with his disciples forty days <sup>b</sup>, and then ascended into heaven in their sight <sup>c</sup>; that before he ascended he ordered them to wait in Jerusalem for the promise of the Father, which was, that the Holy Ghost should come upon them, and endue them with power to be his witnesses, not only in Jerusalem, Judæa, and Samaria, but to the uttermost parts of the earth; and that this promise should be fulfilled within a few days <sup>d</sup>; that his disciples being accordingly met together in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, that is, about ten days after his ascension, the Spirit of God descended on them in a most astonishing manner, enabling them to declare the wonderful works of God in a great variety of languages, which they had never learnt <sup>e</sup>. This was not only foretold by our Saviour, but had been long before prophesied of, and promised by Joel <sup>f</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Acts ii. 22, 23. v. 30. and x. 38, 39.

<sup>b</sup> Acts x. 40, 41. ii. 24. 32. and i. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Acts i. 2. 9, &c.

<sup>d</sup> Acts i. 4, 5, 8.

<sup>e</sup> Acts ii. 1—12.

<sup>f</sup> Acts ii. 16, &c.



And in consequence of these miraculous gifts, the disciples courageously proceeded in executing the commission given them by their Master, bearing witness of his resurrection, not only before the common people of the Jews <sup>g</sup>, but before the Jewish magistrates themselves <sup>h</sup>, openly declaring that they had crucified their Messiah. They confirmed the testimony they gave to the resurrection of Jesus, both among Jews and heathens, by the performance of the greatest wonders <sup>i</sup>, such as restoring decayed limbs <sup>k</sup>, healing the sick, curing the paralytic <sup>l</sup>, and raising the dead <sup>m</sup>. And they conferred the like wonderful powers on others by laying on them their hands <sup>n</sup>.

For my part, I cannot persuade myself that there ever was that man in the world who believed these facts, and was not at the same time convinced in his own mind of the truth of the Christian religion. Whatever men may pretend or say for argument's sake, if once they assent to these facts as true, I make not the least doubt but the conclusion thence arising in their own breasts is, that the Christian revelation is divine. I am not now speaking of a partial belief of the facts related, such as many, both Jews and heathen, might entertain, who imputed them to art magic; but I am speaking of those who have read, considered, and give credit to the whole narration.

I think it scarce possible but that the faith of every man who believes the facts here related must

<sup>g</sup> Acts ii. and iii. 15.

<sup>h</sup> Acts iv. 10. and v. 30, 31.

<sup>i</sup> Acts iv. 33. v. 12, &c. viii. 7. xiv. 3. and xix. 11, 12.

<sup>k</sup> Acts iii. 7. and xiv. 10.

<sup>l</sup> Acts ix. 34.

<sup>m</sup> Acts ix. 40. and xx. 9. 12.

<sup>n</sup> Acts viii. 15. 17. and xix. 6.

at least carry him thus far, that the blessed Jesus, who did such great things for the benefit of mankind when on earth, and after his ascension to heaven empowered his disciples to do the like, is abundantly able to do for his followers all that he has promised, that is, raise them from the dead, receive them to himself, and make them happy. If we believe that he gave health to the diseased, strength to the weak, motion to the paralytic, reason to the lunatic, and life to the dead, when conversant here on earth; if we believe that he arose himself from the dead, and for a long course of years after his ascension performed the same beneficial works for mankind by his followers, not only curing the sick and lame, but also raising the dead; what should hinder us from believing that he is still able to perform the same, and that according to his promise he certainly will raise all the dead, and bestow rewards and punishments suitable to the behaviour of each one in the present life?

When he was here upon earth, and had performed some great and eminent cures, it begat in the people a firm persuasion that he was able to do more of the same kind. This occasioned so great flocking after him, and their bringing from all parts diseased, maimed, and paralytic subjects to him. They made no doubt but what he had done he was still able to do, and we never find that he once disappointed them. Ought not the same reasoning to prevail with us? is it not easy? is it not natural? If we believe that he raised the dead, when living upon earth, that he arose himself from the dead, and that he continued to raise the dead long after his ascension to heaven by the powers he communicated to

his followers, have we not the justest reason to conclude that he is now able to raise the dead, and that according to his promise he certainly will do it?

Some one may indeed say, "There is no necessary connection between what he has done and what he is now able to do: his power may, for what we know, be lessened, or wholly ceased." But unless it can in fact be proved to be so, the presumption is wholly on the other side, that his power continues the same it ever was. When he was here on earth did the people argue in this manner? or was it natural they should? "It is true, he cured many diseased persons yesterday, and the day before; but there is no necessary connection between what he has done and what he is now able to do: his power may, for what we know, be much lessened, or wholly ceased. To what purpose therefore should we bring our sick friends to him to-day?" Had the people reasoned in this manner, would there have been such crowds following him, bringing from all parts the lame and distempered to him? No, certainly. It is evident therefore they believed that what they had seen him do yesterday, he was able also to perform to-day; and for this reason presented to him the maimed and diseased, and had no apprehensions of a disappointment.

There is not that man perhaps in the world, who from seeing the sun daily rise and set, has not concluded that it will continue so to do: or from having observed the several seasons of the year, does not expect each in its turn. It is most certain there is no necessary connection between these two things, that because the sun rose yesterday, and the day before, &c. it will rise to-morrow; and that because

we have had spring, summer, autumn, and winter the last and foregoing years, therefore we shall have them this and the following. Notwithstanding, is there that man upon earth that does not form the conclusion, and firmly believe it will be so? or is there any one that thinks it unjustifiable and blameworthy so to do? In like manner I am persuaded there is no one who really believes the facts related in the History of the Acts, but fully concludes that the same Jesus who raised the dead when here upon earth, who arose himself from the dead, and after his ascension empowered his disciples to raise the dead, will, according to his promise, at length raise all the dead, and render to them according to their deeds. He that amended human nature, and cured its defects; he that restored lost health, withered limbs, and decayed reason, has he not evidently the power of finishing our natures, and making us happy? Is it not also reasonable to conclude that he can as easily inflict pains, diseases, griefs, and whatever other evils he pleases? Have we not then just reason to conclude that he will reward the righteous and punish the wicked as he has declared he will? He that was so punctual in the performance of all his promises, why should we mistrust that he will not perform this? He that so exactly foretold his disciples what would happen to them, and faithfully fulfilled his engagements to them in giving them such miraculous powers, and so undaunted a resolution<sup>o</sup> to bear witness to his resurrection, and spread his doctrine through the world?

Is it not a reasonable presumption, that a person

<sup>o</sup> Luke xxi. 15. Acts vi. 10.

who has been always faithful to his word will continue to be so? Is it not upon this foundation that commerce and business is carried on? Is there any one scruples to trust a man who is well known to keep his word? and should this way of reasoning once fail, must there not be an entire and immediate stop put to trade? Persons may here also say, "There is no necessary connection between what a man has done and what he will do: it is true, he has always kept his word very punctually hitherto; but it does not thence necessarily follow that he will do it for the future." What must be the consequence of such reasoning, but an entire diffidence in one another, and a total stop to all commerce? If it be thought unreasonable to argue in this manner in the common affairs of life, and matters wherein our worldly interest is concerned, is it not equally or indeed more so with regard to the business of the other life, and our eternal interests? Christ has always hitherto faithfully performed every thing that he has promised. Is it not a most reasonable thing thence to conclude that he will continue so to do? and particularly, that he will, according to his promise, raise the dead, judge the world<sup>p</sup>, and render to all according to their behaviour and conduct here?

Should we proceed no further than this in our reasoning, this surely is enough to make us Christians. This alone is sufficient to shew us that Christ is our Master, our Prince, and our Judge, and that

<sup>p</sup> He gave sufficient proof of his qualification for this office by his knowledge of men's hearts when here on earth, and by communicating this knowledge to his disciples when he ascended into heaven. John i. 47. ii. 24, 25. and vi. 64. Acts v. 4, &c.



it is both our duty and interest to submit wholly to him, learning what he teaches, and obeying what he enjoins. But a very little reflection will carry us on to consider, that this eminent Person, who did such great things, must either himself be more than man, or must have been assisted by some one far superior to the human race. We are very sure that it is not in the power of man by a word's speaking to restore decayed limbs or lost reason, much less to raise the dead. How much less yet, to arise himself from the dead, and to grant this power of healing the distempered, and raising the dead, to others, and to enable them to confer it still on others! All these are so like the works of him that made us, that the most natural conclusion is, that the person who performed them was no other than our Creator, who appeared in human flesh under the name of Jesus. Is it easy to conceive that any other than he who first made us should be able to rectify the disorders of our nature by a word's speaking? Who can renew the powers of reasoning and of self-motion, but he who first bestowed them? Who can restore life, but he who gave it? Who can order that the like wonderful effects should follow when others speak in his name, and that these, by laying on their hands, should convey the like miraculous power to others also, but he who has the disposal of all events? As this is the most natural conclusion, so it well agrees with what is said of Christ by his disciples, that *he was in the beginning with God, and that he is God; that all things were made by him, and that without him was there not any thing made that was made*<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> John i. 3. Col. i. 16, 17. 1 Cor. viii. 6.



But should we admit that he effected these great and wonderful things by the direction and through the assistance of the almighty Creator and Governor of the universe, it is the very representation that he himself has given us: *I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me*<sup>r</sup>. *The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me*<sup>s</sup>. And when he was about to cure the man who was blind from his birth, he says, *I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day*<sup>t</sup>. Again he says, *If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him*<sup>v</sup>.

I have chosen this way of reasoning, because it is free from all metaphysical subtlety, and open to the capacity of the meanest. It proceeds upon these two presumptions: that what Christ has done, he is still able to do; and that forasmuch as he has always hitherto been faithful to his word, he will continue so to be. This is a way of reasoning allowed to be good in the affairs of life: and indeed, if persons were not governed in their belief by such reasoning as this, the business of the world would be immediately at a stand. It is true, this way of reasoning does not always prove infallible in matters merely human: a mere man may of a sudden be disabled from doing what he before did with the greatest facility; or he may so change, as not to per-

<sup>r</sup> John vi. 38.

<sup>s</sup> John v. 36. Vid. ch. v. 17. 19, 20.

<sup>t</sup> John ix. 4.

<sup>v</sup> John x. 37, 38.

form what he has promised, although never known to fail of his word before. However, these failures are not so frequent but the way of reasoning still justly prevails, and men are universally governed, both in their belief and practice, by it. Now if men believe and practise agreeably to this way of reasoning in the business of life, wherein they know that it sometimes does fail them, how much more ought they to believe and practise agreeably to it in a case wherein they have not the least ground to suspect that it can or will deceive them! Christ, whose ability and fidelity is in this case to be trusted, has given sufficient demonstration that he is more than man, and that he acted under the direction and influence of the almighty Creator and Governor of the universe. Can the Almighty fail, and deceive us? Most certainly there is a necessary connection between his word and the fulfilment. Has he spoken, and shall it not be done?

The author of the last attempt against Christianity asserts, “ that the power of working miracles has no  
“ connection with the truth of the doctrines taught  
“ by such miracle-workers: that false prophets, and  
“ the most wicked seducers, might and did work  
“ miracles, which they could not have done, had mi-  
“ racles been any evidence or proof of truth and  
“ sound doctrine: that whatever certainty God may  
“ convey to a man’s mind by inspiration, or imme-  
“ diate revelation, the knowledge of any such truth  
“ can go no further upon divine authority<sup>x</sup>. He  
“ could not convince any other man, not thus in-  
“ spired, that he had any such revelation from God;

<sup>x</sup> Moral Philosopher, p. 81, 82.

“ but whosoever should receive it from him, must  
 “ take his own word for it, and depend properly  
 “ upon his authority, and not upon the authority of  
 “ God, unless he could make it appear that he was  
 “ both infallible and impeccable in the case, and  
 “ that he could neither be deceived himself nor de-  
 “ ceive others; and this is so much the prerogative  
 “ of God alone, that I doubt it will never be proved  
 “ of any other <sup>y</sup>. They who in the apostolical times  
 “ had these extraordinary gifts and powers, were  
 “ left at liberty to exercise them upon the common  
 “ principles of reason and human prudence; and  
 “ from hence we find that some made a right use of  
 “ them for edification, while others employed them  
 “ only to serve the purposes of emulation and strife,  
 “ which introduced great confusions and disorders  
 “ among them. And this is an evident proof that  
 “ the persons invested with such extraordinary gifts  
 “ and powers were neither infallible nor impeccable,  
 “ i. e. they were not hereby made incapable either  
 “ of deceiving others or of being themselves de-  
 “ ceived <sup>z</sup>.”

This, it must be owned, is a specious way of talk-  
 ing, and is possibly as much as can be said on that  
 side the question, but is far from coming up to the  
 point, in opposing either the revelation which God  
 was pleased to make to his ancient people the Jews,  
 or that which he has made to us by his son Jesus  
 Christ. God was pleased to reveal the most material  
 part of his will to the whole multitude of the Israel-  
 ites immediately from Mount Sinai by an audible  
 voice. And to make them the more attentive, it

<sup>y</sup> Moral Philosopher, p. 83.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. p. 81.

was preceded with thunders and lightnings, and an earthquake. There was a cloud and thick darkness covered the mountain, and afterwards the appearance of fire and the sound of a trumpet. It was not possible that these things could be a deception. I believe it will be readily granted, that it was not in the power of any man to cover the face of the heavens with clouds and darkness, and speak to more than three millions of people at once with an audible voice, so that each one should distinctly hear what was said. And should we suppose that any being inferior to the almighty Creator and Governor of the universe had it in his power to have exhibited such an appearance as this, we are sure that he could not do it without the divine permission. But is it consistent with the wisdom and goodness of the great Governor of the world to permit a people to be thus inevitably deceived and imposed upon? To this indeed it may be replied, "Has he not suffered many  
"great and large nations to be deceived by Ma-  
"hometan delusion? and have not great numbers  
"been misled by pretended miracles in popish coun-  
"tries?" But these cases are by no means parallel. Mahomet wrought no miracles: his disciples became such through fear. It was merely the want of courage made so great a part of the world submit to his doctrine, for it was propagated wholly by war and conquest. And as to the pretended miracles among the papists, they are impositions which might easily be discovered by men's own natural faculties: and it is entirely owing to their own sloth, carelessness, and negligence, that they suffer themselves to be so egregiously deceived. But in the case before us, it was not in the power of man to discover the

imposition. There were clouds and darkness, thunders and lightnings, and a voice personating the great Creator of all things, and giving forth the most just and reasonable laws, and this in the open air in the daytime, to upwards of three millions of people. How was it possible that any man should suspect a fraud, or entertain a thought that God would permit an inferior invisible power to act thus without an express order and commission from himself? The Israelites were so terrified by this appearance, that they desired for the future that God would speak to them by Moses, and not any more immediately to themselves. The rest of their laws therefore were at their own request delivered to them from God by Moses.

And that God himself was the conductor of this people from the time of their leaving Egypt to their settlement in the Holy Land, is as plain as history and words can make it. And it is as evident from the same history, that if Moses was not directed by God in his marches from Egypt, and through the wilderness, and had not an entire dependance on his immediate interposition to assist and provide for them, he was the weakest man that ever undertook the command of a people, and must certainly have failed of his end. He and all the people with him must have perished, either at the Red sea or in the wilderness. And is not every Jew we meet with in our streets an evidence of the truth of the Mosaic revelation? Is it not expressly foretold by Moses, *And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood*



*and stone*<sup>a</sup>. How comes it to pass that there are any left who profess themselves Jews? Is it not a most astonishing thing, that, after so many dreadful slaughters that have been made of that people, after so many severe persecutions which they have undergone, and the contempt that is thrown upon them in all nations, there should yet remain any who call themselves by that name? Is it owing to their great and singular virtue? Are they not as vicious, at least, as any other people? And in Spain and Portugal do they not at this day comply with all the rites and ceremonies of the Popish religion, and bow down before images of wood and stone? Is it any thing less than a miracle of Providence that can preserve such a people distinct from the rest of the world? There seem to be prophecies both in the Old and New Testament relating to this people yet unfulfilled; and it is very probable that they are thus miraculously kept a distinct people for their accomplishment.

The coming of Christ into the world was foretold by Moses and the succeeding prophets. He is described by them as one that should be more than human; that he should be born of a virgin<sup>b</sup>; that he should be without sin<sup>c</sup>; that he should be Immanuel, or God with us<sup>d</sup>; that he should be called the Mighty God<sup>e</sup>; that one should go before him in the spirit and power of Elias<sup>f</sup>, *who should cry in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight*<sup>g</sup>. The conception of John the Baptist, and that of Christ, were foretold by an angel<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Deut. xxviii. 64. Vid. et 37.

<sup>b</sup> Isaiah vii. 14.

<sup>c</sup> Is. liii. 9. 1 Pet. ii. 22.

<sup>d</sup> Is. vii. 14.

<sup>e</sup> Is. ix. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Mal. iv. 6. Luke i. 17.

<sup>g</sup> Is. xl. 3, 4.

<sup>h</sup> Luke i. 19. 26.



By a vision of angels was the birth of Jesus made known to certain shepherds, who immediately visited the new born Son of God <sup>i</sup>. Wise men, conducted from the east by a miraculous appearance in the heavens, came and made their offerings to him <sup>k</sup>. Simeon and Anna, by a prophetic spirit, received and owned him as the Messiah, when brought an infant to the temple to be presented to the Lord <sup>l</sup>, and spake of him to all them who looked for redemption in Israel <sup>m</sup>. John the Baptist, prophesied of as his forerunner, pointed him out to the people as one far greater and more worthy than himself, who should baptize them with the Holy Ghost <sup>n</sup>, as the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world <sup>o</sup>, as the Son of God <sup>p</sup>, and Judge of the world <sup>q</sup>. Twice was it said of him by a voice from heaven, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased* <sup>r</sup>. And he was demonstrated to be the Son of God with power by his resurrection from the dead <sup>s</sup>. In his discourses to the Jews, he more than once appeals to the great and mighty works wrought by him, as a clear proof that the Father had sent him <sup>t</sup>. And it is most certain that these things could not have been performed without the permission and consent of the great Author and Governor of all things. But is it to be conceived, that an all-wise and gracious Being would give his consent

<sup>i</sup> Luke ii. 8, &c. 17. *And they made known abroad the saying which was told them concerning this child.*

<sup>k</sup> Matt. ii. 1—11.

<sup>l</sup> Luke ii. 22. 25, 26, &c. 36, &c.

<sup>m</sup> Ver. 38.

<sup>n</sup> Matt. iii. 12. John i. 15. 27.

<sup>o</sup> John i. 29.

<sup>p</sup> John i. 18. 24.

<sup>q</sup> Matt. iii. 13.

<sup>r</sup> Matt. iii. 17. and xvii. 5.

<sup>s</sup> Rom. i. 4.

<sup>t</sup> John v. 36. and x. 25. 37. 38.

that mankind should be thus unavoidably deceived? Would he suffer a person to do such works in his name, and as by his authority, in express proof of his coming from him, of being his Son, and bringing his message, if he were not truly the person he represented himself to be. When the Jews sought a sign of him, he often referred them to his resurrection. He said, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up again*<sup>u</sup>. And at another time, *An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth*<sup>x</sup>. When he had thus rested the whole proof of his divine mission on his rising from the dead the third day, is it to be thought that the great Governor of the world would have allowed him to rise on that day, unless he had indeed sent him? Would he also have taken him up into heaven in the sight of all his disciples? Would he have permitted him to have fulfilled his promise in pouring forth the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost? Would he have suffered him to endue his apostles and followers with such wonderful powers, and enable them to do such astonishing works, and thereby spread his gospel in so short a time through the then known world, according to his prediction and promise? I say, would the Father and Maker of all things have allowed this, had not Jesus been what he declared himself to be, the Son of God, and Saviour of the world? Most cer-

<sup>u</sup> John. ii. 19.

<sup>x</sup> Matt. xii. 39, 40. Vid. Matt. xvi. 4. Luke xi. 29.

tainly he would not. It is utterly irreconcilable with the divine attributes.

In the Christian revelation therefore, it is no other than the Son of God himself, he who is both God and man, that has made known the mind of God to us. He is both infallible and impeccable<sup>y</sup>. He neither can be deceived himself, nor deceive any one. He taught his disciples the will of his Father in the most familiar manner for the three years that he lived with them: and after his resurrection was often with them, and instructed them in the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning himself<sup>z</sup>. And for the security of those who should come after, he assured them that the Holy Spirit, which he would give them, should lead them into all truth, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them<sup>a</sup>. So that we have a clear and full promise, that in their representing his doctrine to us they should not deceive us. And these very disciples, to whom he fulfilled this promise, and gave his Holy Spirit, not only taught his sayings by their preaching, but have also left them us in writing. The apostle Paul indeed was not a disciple while Jesus was conversant here on earth, and was a most bitter persecutor of all his followers for some time after his ascension into heaven. His miraculous conversion, and bold appearing for the cause of Christ in the synagogues of the Jews, where he had apprehended and scourged the Christians, was an additional proof of the truth of Christ's mission. And although it is true, that he received his know-

<sup>y</sup> Is. liii. 9. 2 Cor. v. 21. Heb. vii. 26. 1 Pet. ii. 22. 1 John iii. 5. 1 Pet. i. 19.

<sup>z</sup> Luke xxiv. 27. 44. 45, &c.

<sup>a</sup> John xvi. 13. and xiv. 26.

ledge of the Christian doctrine by inspiration, or immediate revelation, yet the exact agreement there is between his writings and those of the other apostles is a confirmation of the truth of Christianity.

You may now plainly see, that the arguments of the author I have cited come not up to the point in opposing either of the revelations which we are concerned with. The most material part of the revealed truths in the first were taught the people immediately by God himself from mount Sinai, and the rest at their own desire by the mediation of Moses. All the truths of the gospel were taught by Jesus, who is both God and man: and both revelations were committed to writing, the former immediately from the mouth of God, the latter by persons who were eye and ear witnesses of what they wrote, and were under the direction of that Spirit who was to guide them into all truth, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever Christ had said unto them. Had all the disciples who have communicated to us the doctrine of Christ received it by inspiration alone, as did St. Paul, there would have been more appearance of weight in the words I have cited from this author; but forasmuch as they received it from Christ's own mouth when here on earth, or by immediate tradition from those that heard him, the arguments he has brought are quite wide from the purpose. And since the doctrine left us by St. Paul, who received it by immediate revelation or inspiration, is so exactly consonant with that which comes to us from the other disciples, it is a great confirmation that we are not imposed upon and deceived.

When the author I have cited says, "that they  
" who in the apostolic times had these extraordi-

“ nary gifts and powers were left at liberty to exercise them upon the common principles of reason and human prudence, and from hence we find, that some made a right use of them to edification, while others employed them only to serve the purposes of emulation and strife, which introduced great confusions and disorders among them ;” we readily allow the truth of all this. And it is nothing more than what our Lord himself foretold : *Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name ? and in thy name have cast out devils ? and in thy name done many wonderful works ? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you : depart from me, ye that work iniquity*<sup>b</sup>. This is so far from being an objection to the truth of the Christian religion, that it confirms it, plainly demonstrating, that our Lord had the knowledge of things future. But if the author means to insinuate that our faith depends on such men as these, who abused the extraordinary gifts communicated to them, his insinuation is utterly false and groundless.

Our faith depends on Christ alone, who is both God and man. He taught his doctrine to his followers : and they, to whom he promised to lead them into all truth, and to bring to their remembrance all things whatsoever he had said unto them, first preached it to the world, and then committed it to writing. And if we believe that he rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and thence gave forth miraculous powers to his disciples, can we admit the least doubt whether he fulfilled this pro-

<sup>b</sup> Matt. vii. 22, 23.



mise? Should we admit that this promise was confined to his immediate disciples, such only as were conversant with him here on earth; and should we suppose that both Mark and Luke were not of that number; (though the contrary be asserted by some of the <sup>c</sup> ancients;) yet, since they wrote their Gospels from the preachings of the apostles Peter and Paul, and both were approved by the apostle John, we are very secure they contain nothing but what is true.

The author indeed in some parts of his work boldly asserts, that there was a wide difference between the doctrine taught by St. Paul and that taught by the other apostles <sup>d</sup>; but the difference assigned by him is entirely the fiction of his own fruitful brain, without any the least foundation either in scripture or history. He acknowledges that when St. Paul went up to Jerusalem by revelation, and communicated to the apostles there the gospel he had preached to the Gentiles, they approved it, and gave him the right hand of fellowship <sup>e</sup>; yet affirms, in express contradiction to history <sup>f</sup> and this apostle's own writings <sup>g</sup>, that afterwards he preached against the decree of the council at Jerusalem, and would not have the Gentile converts to comply with it <sup>h</sup>. That the apostle Peter approved the doctrine taught by St. Paul, is sufficiently evident from the commendation he gives of his Epistles, as you may see, 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. *Even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speak-*

<sup>c</sup> Epiphan. et Dial. contra Marcion. quoted in Basnage, Annal. Vid. Marc. et Luc. in Ind.

<sup>d</sup> Moral Phil. p. 74—80. 363. 364.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. p. 362.

<sup>f</sup> Acts xvi. 4.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. x. 21.

<sup>h</sup> Mor. Phil. p. 79. 363.



*ing in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.* Although the apostle Peter was guilty of dissimulation at Antioch<sup>i</sup> through fear of the Jews which came down from Jerusalem, this is no evidence that he did not approve of the apostle Paul's doctrine; on the contrary, his former practice sufficiently demonstrates that he did approve it; and indeed it was no other than what himself had publicly defended before the Christians at Jerusalem, when he was accused by them of going in to men uncircumcised, and eating with them<sup>k</sup>. This indeed fully proves that the apostles were not impeccable; nor did our Saviour promise that they should be. The servants of God have sometimes failed even in those graces for the exercise of which they have been most eminent. Job betrayed impatience: and Peter, notwithstanding his natural courage and undaunted spirit, and his great zeal, boldness, and forwardness to profess Christ, twice fell through mere cowardice: he denied his Master, and dissembled with the Jewish Christians at Antioch. Our Saviour did not promise that his disciples should not fall into sin, but that in teaching his doctrine he would lead them into all truth. And accordingly in this very point Peter boldly maintained and defended the truth against the Jerusalem Christians, who accused him for what he had done at Cæsarea<sup>l</sup>.

I shall add a brief and plain answer to each of the assertions I have quoted from this author, and

<sup>i</sup> Gal. ii. 11, &c.

<sup>k</sup> Acts xi. 31.

<sup>l</sup> Ver. 17.

conclude this discourse. He says, “that false prophets, and the most wicked seducers, might and did work miracles, which they could not have done, had miracles been an evidence or proof of truth and sound doctrine.” In answer to this, I would ask, of what sort were the miracles wrought by false prophets and seducers? Were they for the manifest benefit of mankind, or were they prejudicial? Were they not always to be distinguished from those wrought by true prophets? It is certain there is come down to us but a very slender account of any particular miracles wrought by false prophets and seducers. If the Egyptian magicians be reckoned of that number, how few things were they able to perform! and those rather noxious than of any advantage. They turned rods into serpents, water into blood, and produced frogs, but could proceed no further. When the dust of the land became lice, they acknowledged this was the finger of God. And when the ashes of the furnace were sprinkled up towards heaven, and became a boil, breaking forth with blains, the magicians were no longer able to stand before Moses, because the boil was upon them as well as the other Egyptians. And although they produced frogs, we find not that they could remove them, any more than any other of the plagues inflicted by Moses<sup>m</sup>. We read that Simon Magus had of a long time bewitched the Samaritans with his sorceries. There is no account of any particular wonder wrought by him; but, in the general, that he had by his practices so worked himself into the esteem of the people, that they looked upon him as

<sup>m</sup> Exod. viii. 8.

*the great power of God.* Nevertheless, no sooner did Philip the deacon appear in Samaria, and perform miracles of real and acknowledged benefit to mankind, than Simon is forsaken, is equally astonished with the rest of the people, and professes himself a convert. Now whatever were the signs and miracles wrought by false prophets and seducers, if they were clearly distinguishable from those performed by true prophets, the latter might be a proof of the truth of doctrines taught, when the former were not.

But, says the same author, “the power of working miracles has no connection with the truth of doctrines taught by such miracle-workers.” That it has no physical connection is readily granted; but that it may have a moral one is without difficulty proved, so that a Providence be allowed. Moses went to the Israelites, and told them, that the God of their fathers had appeared to him, and would deliver them from that heavy bondage they groaned under. And although at first he shewed few other signs than what Pharaoh’s magicians also performed, yet afterwards he inflicted a great variety of plagues on the Egyptians, of which the Israelites, who dwelt among them, felt nothing. Now when they saw their enemies thus annoyed, while at the same time themselves were free, was not this sufficient to convince them that God had really appeared to him, and sent him to be their deliverer, and that it was the will of God they should put themselves under his conduct? And were they not abundantly justified herein, when by killing the passover, according to his direction, their firstborn were saved alive, though all the firstborn of the Egyptians were slain?

Could any reasonable man think that God would bring these plagues upon the Egyptians at the word of Moses, and at the same time secure the Israelites from them, unless he designed their deliverance, and employed Moses to that end? When Korah, Dathan, and Abiram rebelled against Moses in the wilderness, was not the immediate miraculous punishment of these men, together with all who adhered to them, a sufficient indication of the mind of God? Would he have caused the earth to open her mouth and swallow them alive, would he have sent forth fire from his presence, and have consumed them, had they not knowingly and wilfully transgressed his will?

He further says, "Whatever certainty God may convey to a man's mind by inspiration, or immediate revelation, the knowledge of any such truth can go no further upon divine authority. He could not convince any other man not thus inspired that he had any such revelation from God. But whoever should receive it from him must take his own word for it, and depend properly upon his authority, and not upon the authority of God; unless he could make it appear that he was both infallible and impeccable in the case, and that he could neither be deceived himself nor deceive others; and this is so much the prerogative of God alone, that I doubt it will never be proved of any other." Moses comes to the Israelites, and tells them God had appeared to him, and would deliver them. If they believed him upon his bare asserting this, it is very certain they depended on his authority, and so far it was a human faith only. But when it pleased God afterwards to afflict the

Egyptians at the word of Moses with plague after plague, while at the same time the Israelites were exempted; if they believed what Moses said upon conviction from so extraordinary and miraculous a providence, it was a divine faith. They well knew that Moses by his own power could not produce such plagues, nor exempt the Israelites from them. They were fully assured that these things could not be accomplished but by the power or permission of the great Creator of the universe; that herein therefore God himself spake to them, and that as clearly as he did to Moses from the burning bush. There was no manner of necessity for Moses to prove that he was either infallible or impeccable; for God himself, by the miracles wrought at the word of Moses, gave the Israelites most convincing proof that he designed him to be their deliverer.

Did not God speak loudly and clearly by the punishment of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram? Was not the doctrine taught by Moses with regard to the family and function of the priests hereby fully confirmed? and all usurpation of the priesthood condemned? and was not the Israelites' belief of this a divine faith? a faith in God, speaking clearly to them in his providence? We have this author's acknowledgment however, that when the person to whom the revelation is made is infallible and impeccable, he may communicate it to others, and it still continues a divine faith. Is not this evidently the case of all those who receive their faith from Christ?

He also says, "They who in the apostolic times  
"had these extraordinary gifts and powers, were  
"left at liberty to exercise them upon the common  
"principles of reason and human prudence; and



“ from hence we find that some made a right use  
“ of them for edification, while others employed  
“ them only to serve the purposes of emulation and  
“ strife, which introduced great confusions and dis-  
“ orders among them. And this is an evident proof  
“ that the persons invested with such extraordinary  
“ gifts and powers were neither infallible nor impec-  
“ cable, i. e. they were not hereby made incapable  
“ either of deceiving others or being deceived them-  
“ selves.” Our Saviour, who taught the Christian  
revelation, was both God and man, infallible and  
impeccable, incapable of deceiving others or being  
deceived himself. And his immediate disciples,  
though not in all things infallible and impeccable,  
yet had this promise made to them by him, that the  
Holy Spirit should bring all things to their remem-  
brance whatsoever he had said unto them, and  
should lead them into all truth. This is our secu-  
rity, that in all things which they taught or wrote  
as the doctrine of Christ, they were infallibly di-  
rected, and neither could be deceived or deceive.  
And if we proceed further, to those who were con-  
verted by them, and on whom they conferred the  
gifts of the Spirit by laying on their hands, there is  
no doubt but whatever revelations were made to  
them were of great use and service at that time in  
the church, and carried with them sufficient convic-  
tion of their truth; but, as they are not come down  
to us, they noways concern us, nor can be the sub-  
jects of our faith. The imprudences and irregulari-  
ties for which some of these persons in the church  
of Corinth were reprov'd by St. Paul cannot in the  
least affect or hurt us. Does our faith depend upon  
any revelation made to them? or do we receive any



doctrine because delivered by them? To what purpose therefore this is added, unless to confound and mislead the reader, I know not. The extraordinary and miraculous gifts, while the exercise of them continued in this church of Corinth, and other churches, were a standing proof of the power of Christ, and a great confirmation to the faith of all who received him as their Prince and Judge. But as to the particular ends for which revelations were made to any in this church, (for doubtless they had plain, obvious, and useful ends at the time when made,) history does not inform us.

## CHAP. XVIII.

*The objections raised by Rabbi Isaac ben Abraham answered.*

I PROCEED now to the last thing proposed, which is, to answer all the objections that I can find have been at any time started, either with regard to the authority of this book, or the truth of any of the facts related in it. And herein I have in some measure prevented myself, by having obviated various objections, as they came in my way, in the preceding chapters. I shall begin with those raised by Rabbi Isaac the Jew, in his *Chizzouk Emounah*, or *Munimen Fidei*, published and translated by the learned Wagenseil, and at large confuted by Gussetius, who was professor of philosophy in the university of Groningen.

The first objection is taken from Acts i. 6, 7. *When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.* “The persons who ask, you see, do by this “their question acknowledge that the kingdom of “Israel was some time hereafter to be restored, contrary to the opinion of Christians: but he that “answers, does by his answer declare that he is not “the expected Messiah which his followers take “him for, since he does not say that he is the restorer of the kingdom. He at the same time declares, that it cannot be that any man should

“ know when this captivity will have an end, before the time of the end itself comes ; and that God alone, of whose understanding there is no searching, knows it <sup>a</sup>.” This objection arises in part from the mistaken apprehensions of the apostles, in part from a wrong interpretation of our Saviour’s answer, as also from the false idea which the Rabbi entertained of the Messiah’s kingdom. We readily acknowledge that the disciples at that time expected a temporal kingdom to be erected. For which reason our Lord in his answer adds, *But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth ;* intimating, that in a short time they should be fully instructed in the nature of his kingdom, and the powers they were to exercise. In the words quoted by the Rabbi he plainly reproves their curiosity, as having other business before them than that of a temporal kingdom, or the time of erecting it. *It is not for you to know the times or the seasons ;* there is business of another kind and nature lies before you. At the same time our Lord does not say that God had reserved the knowledge of the times and seasons to himself ; for he had in some measure revealed these by the prophets ; but what he says is, *that he had put them in his own power*, that they were in truth under his direction ; and was as much as to say, that the disciples were to perform their duty, and leave all events entirely to God, because he alone had the power of disposing them.

<sup>a</sup> Chizzouk Emounah, par. 2. cap. 59.

It is plain that Rabbi Isaac entertained the same mistaken notion of the Messiah and his kingdom, as did the disciples before they were enlightened by the descent of the Holy Ghost. They thought, that when the Messiah came he was to put an end to the subjection of the Israelites, and grant them a glorious monarchy over the heathen nations. The answer of Jesus, says he, implies in it, that the time was not yet come that the subjection or captivity of Israel should have an end, that this time was known only to God, consequently that he was not the Messiah; for whenever the Messiah comes, the captivity is to have an end, and the kingdom to be restored. But the Jew ought to have remembered, that our Saviour himself declared before Pilate, that *his kingdom was not of this world*, and that the prophecies concerning the Messiah's kingdom are understood by Christians in a spiritual sense.

The observation made by the Rabbi in the next chapter contains no objection to the Acts of the Apostles, but his answer to an argument for the truth of the Christian religion taken from the words of Gamaliel<sup>b</sup>, which was urged upon him by some Lutheran of high rank<sup>c</sup>. This argument is however set in a clear light, and well defended, by Gussenius<sup>d</sup>.

There follow several objections taken from the speech of the protomartyr Stephen, Acts vii. The first is taken from the words in the fourth verse. But that the matter may appear in the clearest light, I shall repeat his words from the beginning:

<sup>b</sup> Acts v. 34, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 60. et p. 1. c. 4.

<sup>d</sup> Veritas salutifera, p. 15.

*The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran, and said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall shew thee. Then came he out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran; and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him to this land, wherein ye now dwell.*

This is represented as a flat contradiction to the history of Moses in the eleventh and twelfth chapter of Genesis, where it is said, that Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abraham, Nahor, and Haran<sup>e</sup>. *And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years: and Terah died in Haran<sup>f</sup>. And Abraham was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran.* Hence, says the Rabbi, it is evident that Terah lived, after Abraham<sup>g</sup> left Haran, sixty years. Terah was but seventy years old when Abraham was born, and Abraham but seventy-five when he departed from Haran. These together make no more than one hundred and forty-five, whereas Terah lived to be two hundred and five, that is, he lived sixty years after Abraham went from Haran. But St. Stephen affirms, that Abraham went not from Haran till after his father Terah's death<sup>h</sup>. This is the objection.

To me, I must own, the more fully I consider this matter, the more clearly it appears that St. Stephen's words are so far from being contradictory to those of Moses, that they give us the true explanation of them, and a more distinct account of this

<sup>e</sup> Gen. xi. 26.

<sup>f</sup> Gen. xi. 32.

<sup>g</sup> Gen. xii. 4.

<sup>h</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 61.

part of history than we should otherways have been masters of. It is observable, first of all, that St. Stephen informs us, that God spake to Abraham while he was yet at Ur of the Chaldees, calling him to leave his country. Of this Moses takes no notice, and the words differ from those recorded by Moses which were spoken to Abraham at Haran. In the former he is commanded to leave his country and kindred; in the latter, also his father's house. He left not his father's house when he went from Ur to Haran, because his father and all his household went with him. And that there was such a double call, is acknowledged by the Jews themselves<sup>i</sup>. 2dly, It is also observable, that in the book of Genesis the account of the death of Terah precedes the history of Abraham's second call, and his departure out of Haran. It is said, *And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years: and Terah died in Haran.* Then immediately follows the account of Abraham's call and departure. Why was the death of Terah inserted in this place, if it were not designed to let us know that he died before Abraham left Haran? It is remarkable, that Moses has said nothing of the deaths of the foregoing patriarchs from Shem to Terah: why should he insert this here, unless for the reason assigned? What Moses has thus more obscurely intimated St. Stephen clearly expresses: *And from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell.* The Rabbi, aware of this, says, "It is usual for the scripture to finish one business before it proceeds to another. Thus it men-

<sup>i</sup> Aben Ezra on Gen. xii. 1. quoted by Lightfoot, vol. 1. p. 780.



“ tions the death of Abraham before the birth of  
 “ Jacob and Esau, although they had completed  
 “ their fifteenth year before Abraham died. And  
 “ thus it mentions the death of Isaac before the sell-  
 “ ing of Joseph, though Isaac was then living.” I  
 may, I think, safely leave it to any one’s considera-  
 tion to determine whether these cases are parallel.

But it will be here asked, How is St. Stephen’s account reconcilable with what Moses has laid down concerning the ages of Terah and Abraham? I answer, Very easily; if we will but allow ourselves to consider, and rightly interpret his words. He says, *Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abraham, Nahor, and Haran.* There is no one, I suppose, understands it that these three were born to him in the same year. It is most reasonable to conclude that two of them were born either before he was seventy, or after it. The matter in debate is, which: if the meaning be, that Terah lived seventy years before he begat the eldest of his three sons, and afterwards begat the other two, there remains no difficulty; nor is there any the least shadow of a reason to be alleged against this interpretation. Terah was seventy years of age before he had any son; after that, were born unto him Abraham, Nahor, and Haran<sup>k</sup>. And that this is the true construction, is fully evident from the use of the same phrase in Gen. vi. where it is said, *And Noah was five hundred years old, and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japhet.* It is certain this must be understood, that Noah then begat the eldest of the three: for it is expressly said of Shem, that *he was one hundred*

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Synop. Crit. et Patr. in Gen. v. 32. et xi. 26.

*years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood*<sup>1</sup>. Noah was six hundred years complete before the flood went off<sup>m</sup>. Hence it appears that Shem was not born till Noah was five hundred and two years old.

The next thing to be considered is, which was the eldest of Terah's sons. Abraham, it is true, is named first; but it by no means thence follows that he was the eldest. It is no uncommon thing with the sacred writers, to name first, not the eldest but the most worthy<sup>n</sup>. Thus is it in naming the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japhet; Shem was the more worthy, but Japhet was the elder<sup>o</sup>. And it is indeed acknowledged by several of the Jews themselves, that Abraham was the youngest son of Terah<sup>p</sup>. If Sarah, Abraham's wife, was the daughter of Haran, as is generally believed both by Jews and Christians, and is expressly related by the historian Josephus<sup>q</sup>, it is demonstrable that Abraham must have been many years younger than his brother Haran. For Abraham was but ten years old when Sarah was born<sup>r</sup>, and Milcah the wife of Nahor, it is probable, was elder than Sarah<sup>s</sup>: so that Haran was a father before Abraham was nine years of age. Now it is but supposing that Haran begat his daughters about the same time of life that his father Terah begat him, that is, when he was sixty-nine and seventy

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xi. 10.

<sup>m</sup> Gen. vii. 11. and viii. 13.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Gen. xxv. 9. et xlviii. 20. Exod. vi. 27. et vii. 6, 7, 10. Josh. xxiv. 4. 1 Chron. i. 28. et ii. 2. <sup>o</sup> Gen. x. 21.

<sup>p</sup> Sanhed. fol. 69. 2. quoted by Lightf. vol. 2. p. 666. et Men. ben Israel in Gen. by Kidder, Dem. vol. 2. p. 225.

<sup>q</sup> Antiq. l. 1. c. 6. §. 5. p. 21. l. 6. et c. 7. §. 1. pr.

<sup>r</sup> Gen. xvii. 17.

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Gen. xi. 28, 29. et Jos. ubi supra.

years of age, and the whole history is plain, and exactly consistent both with itself and the speech of St. Stephen. For then it appears that Abraham was sixty years younger than his brother Haran, was born when his father was one hundred and thirty, and departed not from Haran till after his father's death. This I take to be the matter of fact, and we are indebted to St. Stephen for the clearing it up to us.

There are, I confess, learned men who understand by these words, *Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abraham, Nahor, and Haran*, that the youngest of his three sons was born to him by that time he was seventy years of age<sup>t</sup>. But forasmuch as they produce no example of this construction, I think it ought to be rejected. Some of them have attempted to remove the difficulty which lies upon them from their thus interpreting the words, by the signification of the word μετόκισεν. They readily acknowledge that Terah was not dead till Abraham had left Haran sixty years; nor, say they, does St. Stephen assert that he was. But what he affirms is, that God did not μετοικίζεν, did not grant him a settled habitation in this land, *wherein ye now dwell*, that is, in the land of Judæa, strictly so called, till after his father's death. And according to their computation, it was about sixty years after his departure from Haran that he led an unsettled life, sometimes in Egypt, sometimes among the Philistines, sometimes in Judæa, before he was fixed at Hebron<sup>u</sup>.

In the next chapter, rabbi Isaac asserts in the

<sup>t</sup> Vid. Wolfii Cur. in loc.

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Gussetii Ver. Sal. p. 333.

general, that “ the apostles of Jesus, and authors of  
 “ the Gospels, were unskilful in the Law and the  
 “ Prophets :” and brings for instance the words cited  
 by St. Stephen, Acts vii. 7. *And the nation to whom  
 they shall be in bondage, will I judge, saith God ;  
 and after that shall they come forth, and serve me  
 in this place.* “ These words,” says he, “ are not  
 “ found in the Law. For in Gen. xv. it is written  
 “ only, *And the nation to whom they shall be in  
 “ bondage will I judge, and afterwards shall they  
 “ come out with great substance.* But this writer,  
 “ through want of skill, hath confounded half of this  
 “ saying with half of another saying, adding, *And  
 “ after that, shall they come forth, and serve me in  
 “ this place,* which is taken from the words of Moses  
 “ in Exod. iii. *When thou hast brought forth the  
 “ people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon  
 “ this mountain ;* as is plain to all who will look  
 “ into those places<sup>x</sup>.”

Had the learned Jew shewn, either that God did  
 not speak the words, or the sense of the words here  
 cited, or that they were not spoken of the Israelites,  
 it might have carried the face of an objection. But  
 since, in both the places of the Law referred to, it  
 is both God that speaks, and the Israelites that are  
 spoken of, what unskilfulness does there appear in  
 joining these two places together? Are no two pas-  
 sages of the Law or of the Prophets to be joined to-  
 gether in quoting scripture, although they never so  
 emphatically express or illustrate what they are  
 brought for? If the Jew asserts this, he herein con-  
 demns Moses himself, and the most eminent writers  
 of his own nation. Moses, in repeating the laws he

<sup>x</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 62.

had delivered to the Israelites in the book of Deuteronomy, frequently joins together things which, according to his own account, were spoken to him at different times<sup>y</sup>. And the learned Surenhusius has laid together a great number of quotations from the Talmudic, and other noted Jewish writers, proving that they do the same<sup>z</sup>. It is doubted by some<sup>a</sup> whether St. Stephen took the last part of the words from Exod. iii. and it is very evident that the sense of what is there said is abundantly expressed by God himself in many parts of the Law<sup>b</sup>.

The rabbi raises another objection from the fourteenth verse: *Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls.* “This,” he says, “is an error: for it is written in Gen. xlv. that *all the souls of the house of Jacob which went down into Egypt were threescore and ten*; and in this number of seventy is comprehended Joseph with his two sons. Likewise in Deut. x. *Thy fathers went down into Egypt, threescore and ten persons*<sup>c</sup>.” I answer, These different numbers depend wholly upon the manner of computation. There are two different ways of computing in Gen. xlv. The one includes those descendants of Jacob only who went down with him into Egypt, and then the number is sixty-six. The other includes himself, together with Joseph and the sons which were born to him in Egypt, and then the number is seventy.

<sup>y</sup> Deut. v. 15. Deut. xiv. 1. 3. compared with Lev. xix. 28. and xi. Deut. xvi. comp. with Exod. xii. and xxiii. Vid. Deut. xxii. and xxiv.

<sup>z</sup> Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς. Thes. 7. p. 45, &c.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Whitby in loc.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Exod. xxiii. 25.

<sup>c</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 63.



In the LXX translation of this place the number is seventy-five; and if we may suppose that St. Stephen made his quotation thence, it is an easy matter to say how the computation arises to that number. For in the LXX translation are added a son and grandson of Manasseh<sup>d</sup>, two sons and a grandson of Ephraim<sup>e</sup>. Now although it should be allowed that St. Austin's opinion is true, that Jacob's descent into Egypt comprehends in it the seventeen years that he lived there<sup>f</sup>, yet is it no more than barely pos-

<sup>d</sup> Machir his son, and Gilead his grandson.

<sup>e</sup> Sutalaam and Taam sons, and Edom a grandson.

<sup>f</sup> Quoted by Patr. in Gen. xli. 12. The reason of it is, the difficulty of accounting for the sons of Pharez. If Judah married not till after Joseph was sold, it is not possible Pharez should have two sons when Jacob descended into Egypt. Compare Gen. xli. 46. and xxx. 25. and xxxvii. 2. and xxxviii. 1. Some suppose, among whom is archbishop Usher, that Jacob was married before he had served the first seven years; and although this seems contrary to the express words of Gen. xxix. 20, 21. 27. 30. yet the difficulty there is, to conceive how so many children could be born in the order in which they are said to have been born, in seven years' time, has compelled them to make that supposition. The thing however may be conceived thus: Leah had her first four children in forty months' time. She then remained without conception fifteen months. Dan was born one month after the forty were expired, and Naphtali ten months after him. Gad was born one month after Naphtali, and Asher about ten or eleven months after Gad. Issachar was born one month or two after Asher. Ten months after was born Zebulon, and ten months after, Dinah. This, it must be owned, is quick work; (but we have not wanted examples of the like in our own times;) and the computation makes seven years.

40 months Leah had her four first children,
15 months without conception,
9 months after had Issachar,
10 months after had Zebulon,
10 months after Dinah.
<hr/> 84 months, or seven years.



sible that these five persons, descended from Manasseh and Ephraim, should have a right to be included in this reckoning<sup>g</sup>. I cannot therefore persuade myself that St. Stephen took this number from the LXX. Both the calculations I have mentioned exclude Jacob's sons' wives; for they are expressly excepted in the twenty-sixth verse. It appears highly probable to me that St. Stephen in his calculations takes them in: for his words are, that Joseph *sent and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred*<sup>h</sup>; which kindred amounted to threescore and fifteen souls. It is sufficiently evident from the expression, that Joseph and his two sons, as well as his father Jacob, are here excluded. The number without these is, as you have heard, sixty-six. Now if we only suppose that four of the patriarchs had by this time lost their wives, which is no unreasonable supposition, for we read that Judah's wife was dead;

<sup>g</sup> Joseph was but fifty-seven years of age when his father died. He married not till after thirty, Gen. xli. 46. 50. Supposing that he had Manasseh at thirty years of age and ten months; and ten months after had Ephraim; that Ephraim had a son at twelve years and nine months old, and his son also had a son at twelve years and nine months: these, added together, make fifty-seven years and two months. And to admit this, we must suppose that which is very highly improbable, viz. that Manasseh and Ephraim, and their two eldest sons, were all married at about twelve years of age.

<sup>h</sup> The word *συγγένειαν*, here made use of, will very well bear this signification: for in the LXX translation, a father's brother's wife is called *συγγενής*, Lev. xviii. 14. and xx. 20. And thus kindred by affinity, and particularly sons-in-law, are termed by Josephus; of which you may see various instances in Kidder's Dem. vol. 2. p. 230. So that there is not the least need of the remark of Gussetius, that Jacob's sons might possibly follow the sentiments of Abraham, Isaac, and Rebecca, and take them wives from those who were their relations by consanguinity.

and it is not improbable that Reuben's being without a wife was the occasion of his committing incest with his father's concubine; I say, if we suppose that four of them had buried their wives, there were seven now living to accompany Jacob into Egypt; to which if we add the wife of Pharez the son of Judah, and the wife of Beriah the son of Asher<sup>i</sup>, these nine, added to the sixty-six, amount to the seventy-five persons computed by St. Stephen. Or if we take it for granted that Hezron and Hamul the sons of Pharez, were not born till some time after Jacob's arrival in Egypt, which is the opinion of many learned men, and that upon no unreasonable grounds<sup>k</sup>; the number of persons proceeding out of Jacob's loins, which actually went down with him into Egypt, were sixty-four; to which if we add the ten wives of Jacob's sons, (Judah's wife being dead,) and the wife of Beriah the son of Asher, this makes the number of persons who were Jacob's kindred, and went down with him into Egypt, seventy-five; as is asserted by St. Stephen. And that Joseph sent and called the wives of his brethren, is evident from the history in Genesis, where it is expressly said, that *Pharaoh commanded Joseph to take waggons for the little ones, and the wives of his brethren*, and that Joseph acted accordingly<sup>l</sup>.

<sup>i</sup> Because Pharez and Beriah are said to have two children each, which are numbered in the list of names, Gen. xlv.

<sup>k</sup> If these were born before Jacob's descent into Egypt, we must suppose that, quite contrary to the usual practice of those, and indeed of all times, Judah himself, and his two sons, Er and Onan, as also his son Pharez, were married at the age of about twelve or thirteen years.

<sup>l</sup> Gen. xlv. 18, 19. 21. and xlv. 5.

The learned Surenhusius has justly observed that additions to and subtractions from genealogies are not uncommon in the Old Testament, and that the very same reasonings whereby the Jews themselves account for these alterations will perfectly well answer such as are found in the New Testament <sup>m</sup>.

There are several objections made to the words immediately following verses 15, 16. *So Jacob went down into Egypt, and died, he and our fathers, and were carried over into Sichem, and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the son of Sichem.* Rabbi Isaac charges these words of St. Stephen with no less than five mistakes. He asserts, “that Jacob  
“ was not buried in Sichem, but in the cave of Mac-  
“ pelah, which is in Hebron: that the fathers, that  
“ is, the heads of the tribes, were buried in Egypt,  
“ Joseph only excepted, who was buried at Sichem,  
“ in part of the field which Jacob bought of Hamor  
“ the father of Sichem for one hundred pieces of  
“ money: that Abraham bought not Sichem, but  
“ only the cave of Macpelah, which is in Hebron;  
“ and that he bought it not of the sons of Hamor  
“ the son of Sichem, but of Ephron the Hittite:  
“ that it was Jacob who bought part of the field  
“ which is in Sichem, and not Abraham. And  
“ whereas it is said he bought it of the sons of Ha-  
“ mor the son of Sichem, it ought to be said, of the  
“ father of Sichem. All which things are manifestly  
“ deduced from the twenty-second, thirty-third, forty-  
“ ninth, and fiftieth chapters of Genesis, and the  
“ end of the book of Joshua.” He adds, “All this

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Βίβ. καταλ. de Genealog. Thes. x. and in Matt. i. 17.

“ shews the unskilfulness of the disciples and apostles of Jesus in the words of the Law and the Prophets <sup>n</sup>.”

But it will be very obvious to any one, upon the least consideration, that four out of the five objections here made are without all manner of foundation. First of all, St. Stephen does not affirm that Jacob was buried at Sichem; and, secondly, there is not the least proof that the fathers, or the heads of the tribes, were buried in Egypt. Rabbi Isaac says it; but we have no more than his bare assertion for it: and had he given us proof of it, he must also have shewn that they were not afterwards taken up and carried into the land of Canaan, together with the bones of their brother Joseph. For is it not most reasonable to believe that they had each of them the same desire of being carried into the land of Canaan, as had their father Jacob, and their brother Joseph? The Jewish historian Josephus expressly tells us that they were buried in the land of Canaan <sup>o</sup>. So does rabbi Solomon Jarchi, a noted Jewish writer <sup>p</sup>; as also does the author of the Life of Moses, another Jew <sup>q</sup>; and the Talmud itself <sup>r</sup>; and St. Jerom speaks of their sepulchres as what were to be seen near Sichem in his time <sup>s</sup>. Again, thirdly, St. Stephen does not affirm that Abraham bought Sichem, but a sepulchre. Nor, in the fourth place, does he say that Emmor was the son of Si-

<sup>n</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 63.

<sup>o</sup> Antiq. l. 2. c. 8. §. 2. et de Bell. l. 4. c. 9. §. 7.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Whitby in loc.

<sup>q</sup> Quoted by Gusset. Ver. Sal. P. 1. p. 335. n. 70.

<sup>r</sup> Hieros. Sotah, fol. 17, 3. et Gloss. in Bavakama, fol. 92, 1. cited by Lightf. vol. 2. p. 668.

<sup>s</sup> Epitaph. Paulæ.

chem. On the contrary, the Greek words are very rightly rendered by our translators, *the father of Sicheu*. The Jewish rabbi, it is probable, was herein deceived by some translation, wherein it was mistakenly rendered *son of Sicheu*.

The only difficulty to be accounted for is, Wherefore is it said that Abraham bought the sepulchre of the sons of Emmor, the father of Sicheu, when it appears from the history that he bought it of Ephron the Hittite? In answer to this I would observe to you, that it was usual with the Hebrews, when reciting the history of their forefathers to their brethren, to do it in the briefest manner, because it was a thing well known to them. For which reason they made use of frequent ellipses, that is, defective speeches, and gave but hints to bring to their remembrance what they aimed at<sup>t</sup>. This is the case in the verses before us; and as nothing is more easy than to supply the words that are here wanting, so, when supplied, the narration is exactly agreeable to the history delivered in the Old Testament: *Jacob went down into Egypt, and died, he and our fathers; and our fathers were carried over into Sicheu, and they were laid*, that is, some of them<sup>u</sup>,

<sup>t</sup> Vid. Lightf. vol. 1. p. 781, 782. vol. 2. p. 668. and Surenhus. in loc.

<sup>u</sup> This sentence is to be taken distributively. Of such sentences there are frequent instances in the Old Testament. Thus Neh. xiii. 1, 2. *It was found written, that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God for ever; because they met not the children of Israel with bread and with water, but hired Balaam against them, that he should curse them:* whereas, according to the history, it was the Moabite alone that hired Balaam. See Numb. xxii. 5. Josh. xxiv. 9. So Jer. xxi. 7. *I will deliver Zedekiah king of Judah, and his servants, and the*



Jacob at least, *in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money*; and some of them, Joseph at least, in the sepulchre bought *of the sons of Emmor, the father of Sichem*<sup>x</sup>. There want only those three small words in the Greek, καὶ ἐν τῷ, in English, *and in that*, to have made this sense clear and obvious to every one: which words doubtless, or rather what is answerable to them in the Hebrew language, in which probably they were spoken, were easily understood and supplied by those to whom St. Stephen addressed himself<sup>y</sup>. The defects to be supplied are of such words as go before and are to be repeated from them; a thing not uncommon in the Old Testament. Thus in Numb. xxvi. 4. *Take the sum of the people or congregation*, is necessarily to be repeated from the second verse. And thus, Ps. cxxxiii. 3. the words literally translated are, *As the dew of Hermon, that descended upon the mountains of Zion*. But it is well known that Hermon and Zion were at too

*people, into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and into the hand of their enemies, and into the hand of those that seek their life: and he shall smite them with the edge of the sword*; that is, he shall smite some of them; for Zedekiah himself and many of the people were saved alive, and carried captives to Babylon. See Jer. xxxix. 7, 8. 9. 2 Kings xxv. 7.

<sup>x</sup> Josh. xxiv. 32. If we compound the matter between Josephus and Jerom, we may suppose one half of the twelve patriarchs to be buried near Hebron, the other half near Sichem. Yet there are no contemptible reasons to incline us to believe they were all buried at Sichem. See Lightf. vol. 1. p. 782. and vol. 2. p. 688. Some have endeavoured to make it appear probable that the field, even at Sichem, was first purchased by Abraham. See Lightf. vol. 2. p. 669, 670.

<sup>y</sup> See Lightf. vol. 1. p. 782, prop. fin.



great a distance for the dew to descend from the one to the other: therefore are the words *as the dew* to be repeated; *As the dew of Hermon, and as the dew that descended upon mount Zion*. Thus in the verse before us are the words *in the sepulchre* to be repeated; *in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money, and in the sepulchre bought of the sons of Emmor the father of Sichem*.

The rabbi raises another objection from the forty-third verse, complaining that the words of the prophet Amos are misquoted. But it will immediately appear to any one who will give himself leave to compare the words together, that St. Stephen has given a most just interpretation of the prophet's words<sup>2</sup>. I shall not therefore now spend your time in mentioning the particulars. The two next remarks<sup>3</sup> made by this rabbi are not against the book of Acts in particular; and therefore I shall pass them over, and proceed to what he says against the words of St. Paul, Acts xiii. 21. *And when they asked a king, he gave them Saul the son of Cis, of the tribe of Benjamin, who reigned forty years*. "You see Paul mistaken in this saying; for Saul

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Gussetii Ver. Sal. P. 2. p. 416, 417.

<sup>3</sup> The first of these, contained in chap. lxxv. is taken from Acts viii. 9. where we have an account of the arts of Simon Magus, and the effect they had upon the people. "Hence," says he, "may an argument be drawn against the miracles of Jesus, which were performed by the magic art; and therefore the silly people who followed him believed him also to be a god, as we see it happen at this day." The next in chap. lxxvi. is taken from the vision of Peter, Acts x. 11. In opposition to which he endeavours to shew that a distinction of meats, and of things clean and unclean, are necessary to holiness.

“reigned not so long : for before he committed the  
 “offence in the affair of the Amalekites, he reigned  
 “only two years, as it is written 1 Sam. xiii. *And*  
 “*Saul was the son of one year when he began to*  
 “*reign, and he reigned two years over the Israel-*  
 “*ites.* The sense of which is, From the time that  
 “Saul was anointed by Samuel, till the government  
 “was given to him by all the Israelites, was one  
 “year, and then he chose three thousand men of  
 “Israel. Then he reigned two years with the con-  
 “sent of all Israel, before he offended in the affair  
 “of the Amalekites. From that time he was esteem-  
 “ed as a man dead ; for the Spirit of God troubled  
 “him, and therefore the years of his reign are not  
 “computed. For which reason Samuel the prophet  
 “lamented him, and at the same time God sent him  
 “to anoint David to be king ; nor could it be that  
 “David should be much under the twentieth year  
 “of his age when he was anointed : for the scrip-  
 “ture immediately after describes him to us as a  
 “grown man : 1 Sam. xvi. 18. *Behold, I have seen*  
 “*a son of Jesse the Bethlehemite, that is cunning*  
 “*in playing, and a mighty valiant man, and a*  
 “*man of war, and prudent in matters, and a come-*  
 “*ly person, and the Lord is with him.* But, be-  
 “hold, David, when he took upon him the govern-  
 “ment after the death of Saul, was no more than  
 “thirty years of age, as is expressly written 2 Sam. v.  
 “It follows from this calculation, that Saul reigned  
 “not even ten years to the day of his death : and  
 “it may be that he reigned a less time, as writes  
 “the learned author of the book Ikkarim <sup>b</sup>.”

<sup>b</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 67.

This is the objection made by the Jew. But, first of all, it is so far from being certain that St. Paul affirms, as the Jew here represents him, that *Saul reigned forty years*, that it is disputed among the learned whether that be his meaning or not; and I think a great part, if not the generality of learned men, have determined that in the forty years mentioned he intended to include the government of Samuel as well as that of Saul. And, secondly, supposing he had expressly affirmed this, is there any thing advanced by the rabbi which proves the contrary? That Saul reigned two years only with the consent of all Israel, before he offended in the affair of the Amalekites, is an interpretation put upon an obscure passage of scripture without any the least foundation; nor is it possible that in so short a time the things related to be done by Saul should have been performed. See 1 Sam. xiv. 47. It is a much more probable sense which is put on the words by our late learned bishop Kidder: "After the Philistines were subdued by Samuel, a year past, when Saul began to reign. And after this he reigned two years free from their yoke." After this, as the subsequent history in 1 Sam. fully informs us, Saul was brought under by them, and his people in slavery to them. When this yoke was broken by the victory over the Philistines begun by his son Jonathan, it is said, *So Saul took the kingdom over Israel*, that is, he recovered it again<sup>c</sup>. For before the Israelites were wholly under the power of the Philistines, inasmuch that they suffered not a smith throughout all the land of Israel, or a sword or a spear to be in

<sup>c</sup> 1 Sam. xiv. 47. See Kidder's Demonstr. vol. 2. p. 240.

the possession of any. And after he thus recovered the kingdom, it is immediately added, *that he fought against all his enemies on every side, against Moab, and against the children of Ammon, and against Edom, and against the kings of Zobah, and against the Philistines: and whithersoever he turned himself, he vexed them.* So that from the end of the two years here mentioned to his committing the offence in the affair of the Amalekites must have intervened the space of many years. He was doubtless some years under the yoke of the Philistines. It must have been a work of time to have made so entire a reduction of the Israelites as not to suffer a smith, or a grindstone, or a sword, or spear to be found among them. And when freed from this yoke, to obtain so many conquests over the several nations around him as are afterwards mentioned, must certainly have been the work of not a few years. All therefore that the Jew adds concerning Samuel's anointing David, and the age of David when anointed, and his age when he took upon him the government after the death of Saul, are foreign to the purpose, because it is most evident that Saul's offence in the affair of the Amalekites, and the anointing of David, which was subsequent to that offence, did not happen in the beginning of Saul's reign, as the Jew would have us believe without any shadow of proof, but when he had now been king many years.

I add further, in the third place, that Josephus the Jewish historian expressly relates that Saul reigned forty years, eighteen years during the prophet Samuel's life, and twenty-two years after his

death<sup>d</sup>. And that he certainly reigned much longer than the ten years assigned him by rabbi Isaac, is fully evident from the history of the Old Testament. For we are therein told, that his youngest son Ishbosheth was forty years of age at the time of his father's death<sup>e</sup>. And yet his father is said to be but a young man when he was first inaugurated by Samuel<sup>f</sup>. Had Saul reigned no more than ten years, his youngest son must have been thirty years old when he began to reign. Could a person who had several sons, the youngest of which was thirty years of age, with any propriety be said to be a young man? It is much more probable he should begin his reign about the time his youngest son was born.

<sup>d</sup> Antiq. l. 6. c. 14. §. 9.    <sup>e</sup> 2 Sam. ii. 8. 10.    <sup>f</sup> 1 Sam. ix. 2.

## CHAP. XIX.

*Further objections of the rabbi answered.*

THE next objection raised by the Jew is to St. Paul's alleging those words of the second Psalm, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, to prove that Jesus is the Son of God, Acts xiii. 33. "For David," says he, "by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, spake that whole Psalm of himself about the beginning of his reign, when he heard that the nations had gathered themselves together against him; as it is written, 2 Sam. v. *But when the Philistines heard that they had anointed David king over Israel, all the Philistines came up to seek David*<sup>a</sup>." As he brings no argument to make good this assertion that David spake this Psalm of himself, so it is very little he says in answer to those things which shew that it was spoken, not of David, but of the Messiah. Nor does he so much as take notice of the concluding expression in the Psalm, which fully proves that it belongs to the Messiah, and to him only, that is, *Blessed are all they that put their trust in him*. This clearly evinces that the person spoken of must be God. For how often are we in the sacred writings, and particularly in the Book of Psalms, cautioned against putting our trust in man, even the greatest of men! Psalm cxlvi. 3. *Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help*<sup>b</sup>. Nay a curse is denounced by the prophet Jeremy on those

<sup>a</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. cap. 68.

<sup>b</sup> See Psalm lxii. 8, 9. and cxviii. 8, 9. Is. ii. 22.



who do so, Jer. xvii. 5. *Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord.* On the other hand, we are constantly directed to make God alone our refuge and trust<sup>c</sup>, and the man who does so is pronounced blessed, Jer. xvii. 7. *Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, whose hope the Lord is.* And to the same purpose in many places of the Psalms<sup>d</sup> and Proverbs<sup>e</sup>. It is also said in the sixth verse of the second Psalm, *I have anointed my king upon my holy hill of Zion.* This passage is taken notice of by the rabbi, and all he says in answer to it is, that “Zion was the royal city, and is also “called the city of David;” but never attempts to prove that David was inaugurated there. David, though anointed king three times, was not once anointed upon Zion; nor indeed was the fortress of Zion as yet subdued by him, nor under his dominion, even when anointed the last time at Hebron. And how very little do agree to David those words of the seventh verse, *Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* The conquests which David made upon the Philistines, the Moabites, the Edomites, the Ammonites, and other neighbouring nations taken notice of by the rabbi, can never surely be thought to come up to these expressions. Besides, the ancient Hebrew doctors themselves, such as Aben Ezra, Raschi, Kimchi, interpret this Psalm of the King Messiah,

<sup>c</sup> Ps. iv. 5. 8. xviii. 30, 31, 32. xxxvii. 3. 5. 39. 40. lxii. 2. 5—8. and cxv. 9, 10, 11.

<sup>d</sup> Ps. xxxiv. 8. xl. 4. cxv. 1. and cxlvi. 5.      <sup>e</sup> Prov. xvi. 20.

and acknowledge that the sense is much more clear and plain when applied to the Messiah, than when applied to David <sup>f</sup>.

Another objection is taken from Acts xiii. 35, 36, 37. where St. Paul cites those words of Psalm xvi. *Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption*; and to prove that this must belong to Christ, adds, *that David after death did in his body see corruption; but Jesus, whom God raised from the dead, saw no corruption*. In opposition to this the rabbi alleges, that the Hebrew word *schachath*, there used by the Psalmist, “does not signify corruption in the sense in which St. Paul takes it <sup>g</sup>.” But, first of all, this Hebrew word was so rendered by the Jews themselves long before St. Paul’s time. For the Greek word, from which St. Paul argues, is the very word by which the LXX translated it. And so it was afterwards; rabbi Kimchi quotes from Midrash, or an interpretation of the Psalms, this sentence: “The Psalmist here teaches, that after death the worms should not destroy him <sup>h</sup>,” which is exactly the same interpretation as is put on the words by St. Paul. 2dly, It is sufficiently evident from the root, whence the word proceeds, that this is its true and proper signification. The root signifies *to destroy, to corrupt*, and is used concerning the girdle of the prophet Jeremy, to express to us that it was marred or putrefied <sup>i</sup>. And, 3dly, the word itself is to be taken

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Surenhusii βιβ. καταλ. p. 406. 592.

<sup>g</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. cap. 69.

<sup>h</sup> Vid. Sinops. Crit. in loc. et Bithneri Lyra Proph.

<sup>i</sup> Jer. xiii. 7.

in this sense in other parts of holy writ, particularly Job ix. 31<sup>k</sup>. Ps. lv. ult<sup>l</sup>.

The next objection is taken from the beginning of Acts xv. But as this relates to the Christian religion in general, which he falsely accuses of being more difficult to be observed than the law of Moses, and contains nothing in particular against the Acts of the Apostles<sup>m</sup>, I shall pass it by. There is another taken from Acts xv. 17. wherein he charges the apostle James “with altering the words of the “prophet Amos in order to prove his religion<sup>n</sup>.” But first of all the apostle James quotes those words as they were translated by the Jews themselves long before his time: for it is the translation of the

<sup>k</sup> We have translated it, *Thou shalt plunge me in a ditch*; but the true meaning is, *Thou shalt cause my body so to corrupt and putrefy, that my own clothes shall abhor me.*

<sup>l</sup> In our translation, *Shalt bring them down into the pit of destruction.* *The pit of the pit*, according to the rabbi's interpretation of this word, would be a strange expression. The truth is, it is the pit of corruption, the pit in which their bodies shall decay, corrupt, and putrefy.

<sup>m</sup> He represents these words of St. Peter, *Wherefore do you put a yoke upon the disciples, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear? But we believe, that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved*, as contradicting the advice given by our Saviour to the rich man, Matt. xix. which was to *keep the commandments: Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother, and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.* “In these words,” says the rabbi, “Jesus teaches, that no man can obtain salvation without keeping the commands of the Mosaic law.” Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 70. To this I shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

<sup>n</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 71.

LXX which is here used<sup>o</sup>. And, 2dly, it is also evident that, take the words either according to the letter of the Hebrew text, or according to the LXX, they fully prove what they are produced for by St. James, that is, the intention of the Almighty to extend his favour to other nations as well as the Jews. And, 3dly, the Talmudic<sup>p</sup> and other Jewish writers<sup>q</sup> interpret this passage of the prophet Amos, of the kingdom of the Messiah. And, 4thly, it is very clear that rabbi Isaac, by his interpretation, oversets the plain, natural, grammatical sense of the words. For what is in the Hebrew spoken of the heathen nations, he confines to the Jewish. What is in the Hebrew, *And all the nations that are called by my name*<sup>r</sup>, he renders thus; “And the Israelites shall possess all nations, because they, that is the Israelites, are called by my name.”

In the next chapter he observes, that Christians are not obedient to the apostolic decree, which forbids the eating of things strangled, and of blood<sup>s</sup>. And in the chapter following accuses the chastity of Timothy's mother, because, being a Jewess, she married an uncircumcised Greek<sup>t</sup>. But these things

<sup>o</sup> It is sufficiently plain that the LXX read the Hebrew something differently from what it is in our present copies. Vid. Gusset. Ver. Sal. p. 2. p. 425. and Surenhus. βιβ. κατ. p. 433. What St. James did is uncertain, because St. Luke, in relating, might make use of the LXX version. Vid. Lightfoot, vol. 2. p. 694. and p. 810, fin.

<sup>p</sup> Sanhed. fol. 69, 2. cited by Lightf. vol. 2. p. 694, pr.

<sup>q</sup> Aberbinel, cited by our most learned bishop Chandler in his Defence of Christianity, p. 174, who there says, that the Jews are pretty unanimous in saying this is a prophecy of the Messias.

<sup>r</sup> Vecol hagioim asher nikra shemi alei hem.

<sup>s</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 72.

<sup>t</sup> Ibid. c. 73.

noways affecting the history of the Acts, I shall pass them over. The next objection is taken from Acts xvi. 3. wherein it is related that St. Paul circumcised his disciple Timothy. This he represents as “an overthrowing the Christian religion, by  
 “ which it is believed that circumcision was a temporary command, to endure only to the coming of the Messiah. But,” adds he, “you here see that  
 “ Paul circumcised Timothy, even after the death of Jesus. Moreover Paul did this in direct contradiction to his own sayings: for in his 1 Cor. vii. 18. he says, *He that is uncircumcised, let him not become circumcised.* If this be right, wherefore does he circumcise his uncircumcised disciple?  
 “ He says also in his Epistle to the Galatians, ch. v. 2, 3. *Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.* If this  
 “ be true, wherefore does he circumcise him, since Christ was to profit him nothing? But since he  
 “ certainly did circumcise him, wherefore did he not enjoin him to keep all the Mosaic precepts? Behold, even Paul himself also was circumcised:  
 “ wherefore then did not he perform the precepts of the Mosaic law? Nay, but he persuaded others  
 “ that they should not perform them. Wherefore also did he initiate Timothy his disciple by the  
 “ precept of circumcision, if, as they will have it, the season or time of observing it was already  
 “ past<sup>u</sup>?” Another Jewish writer charges St. Paul with hypocrisy and meanness of spirit noways be-

<sup>u</sup> Chiz. Em. c. 74.



coming a person inspired, in that he circumcised Timothy for fear of the Jews<sup>x</sup>.

In order to clear the apostle Paul from these heavy accusations, and to shew that he was guilty of no hypocrisy, no meanness of spirit, no inconsistency, no unsteadiness in this affair, it will be necessary to consider more fully, first, what he has said upon the subject of circumcision; and, secondly, the reason that induced him to circumcise Timothy. By comparing these together, it will be no difficult matter to form a judgment whether he is deserving of the censures passed upon him by the Jews or not.

His opinion of circumcision is reducible to these three things: first, that after the death of Christ the command enjoining circumcision was no longer obliging, nor was any person from that time bound to submit to it as a divine institution. For he was fully persuaded that the whole ceremonial law was abolished by the death of Christ, that *Christ had blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross*, as he writes in his Epistle to the Coloss. ii. 14. *Having abolished in his death the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace*, as he writes to the Eph. ii. 15.

2. That circumcision, considered in itself, and not as enjoined by God, is a thing indifferent, and that neither the performing nor omitting it can recommend us to God. This is clearly laid before us in

<sup>x</sup> Kidder's Demonst. vol. 2. p. 245.



his 1 Cor. vii. 18, 19. *Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping the commandments of God*; that is, if circumcision be not considered as a divine command, it is of no manner of significancy, it is altogether indifferent. Therefore in the verses immediately preceding, he advises the Corinthian Christians to be wholly indifferent about it. *Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any man called in uncircumcision? let him not become circumcised.* He had the same opinion of all the ceremonial injunctions of the Mosaic law: since by the death of Christ they were abrogated, and there was now no divine command either enjoining or forbidding them, it was a thing wholly indifferent whether they were performed or neglected. But,

3. Whoever of the Christian converts submitted to circumcision, as being necessary to salvation, was obliged to perform the whole Mosaic law, and could expect no benefit from the death of Christ. This he has fully declared in his Epistle to the Gal. v. 1—4. *Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.* That this passage must be understood of those who sought for and expected salvation from their being circumcised and observing the law of Moses, is fully evident from the words themselves: *Whoever of you are justified*

*by the law*, that is, whoever of you depend on justification from your performance of the Mosaic law, *ye are fallen from grace*. The same is also to be learnt from other passages of this Epistle. He speaks, in the second chapter, of *false brethren, who would have compelled Titus to be circumcised*. And, ch. vi. 12. says, *As many as make a fair shew in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised*. What was this compulsion or constraint, but their teaching that it was necessary to salvation?

It appears also very fully to have been St. Paul's opinion, that no person whatsoever could be justified or saved by his observing the Mosaic precepts. For this he often inculcates both in his Epistle to the Romans iii. 20. and ix. 31, 32, and in that to the Gal. ii. 16. and iii. 10—13. Nor was St. Paul singular in this his opinion. No; the whole body of the apostles and elders were of the same mind, as appears from the decree made by the council held at Jerusalem. For there were certain of the sect of the Pharisees who, becoming converts to Christianity, taught the believing Gentiles, that *except they were circumcised, and kept the law of Moses, they could not be saved*, Acts xv. 1. 5. 24. But the apostles and elders, convened on purpose to give their sentiments on this subject, unanimously agree to send messengers to the Gentile converts with a letter, wherein they not only deny that the persons who taught this doctrine had any authority from them so to do, but call it *a subverting their souls*. Which amounts to the same sense with the phrases used by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, *their falling from grace*, and *Christ's profiting them nothing*. It is therefore, you see, the unanimous sense of the apo-

stles and elders, and of the whole church assembled at Jerusalem, that the law of Moses was not obligatory on the Gentile converts, and that the preaching up circumcision, and the observance of the law of Moses, as necessary to salvation, was subverting the souls of the hearers. The apostle Peter concludes his speech in that assembly with these words: *Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?* that is, they were not able so to perform the precepts of the Mo-saic law, as thereby to obtain justification and life. He therefore adds, *But we believe, that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved even as they.* It was St. Peter's judgment therefore, and no doubt the other apostles were of the same mind, that no man could be justified by the works of the law of Moses, but by the grace of Christ.

Having thus considered the opinion of St. Paul and of the other apostles concerning circumcision, let us next attend to the motive which induced him to circumcise Timothy. It is related, Acts xvi. *Timothy being well reported of by the brethren at Lystra and Iconium, him would Paul have to go forth with him;* that is, to assist him in the ministry; *and took him and circumcised him, because of the Jews which were in those quarters: for they all knew that his father was a Greek.* It is well known that the Jews would not converse freely with those who were uncircumcised. And although our Saviour had given an express commission to his disciples to *go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the*

*Holy Ghost*, yet St. Peter had a vision to teach him to call nothing common or unclean, before he durst venture to keep company with, or come to one of another nation, Acts x. 28. *And when Peter after this came to Jerusalem, they who were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them*, Acts xi. 2, 3. Of what service then do you think could Timothy have been to St. Paul among the Jews, had he not been first circumcised? It was St. Paul's custom, wherever he came, to make the first offers of the gospel to the Jews: how could Timothy have been assisting to him herein, had he not been circumcised? Who among the Jews would have conversed with him? The reason why St. Paul circumcised Timothy is said to have been, *because of the Jews which were in those quarters*: not for fear of the Jews, not from hypocrisy and meanness of spirit, as one of the objecting Jews would have it; but that the Jews might not shun his company, he might have opportunities of conversing freely with them, and instilling into them the Christian doctrine, and by that means assist St. Paul in converting them to the Christian faith. This was the true reason of his circumcising him. Though his mother was a Jewess, they all knew that his father was a Greek; and therefore would have avoided his society, had it not been known that St. Paul circumcised him.

Having thus considered both St. Paul's opinion of circumcision, and the reason which induced him to circumcise Timothy, let us compare them together, that we may see if there be any the least inconsistency between them. Circumcision was now, ac-

according to his opinion, become a thing indifferent, that might be performed, or might be omitted, without any offence to the divine Being: he uses it as such in order to compass a beneficial end. He did not circumcise Timothy as judging it any ways necessary to his salvation, but as a proper means to accomplish the salvation of others. As none but Jews could converse freely with Jews, and so be in a capacity to convert them to the Christian faith, it was absolutely necessary that all who were employed in that office should be circumcised, and observe the law of Moses. For the same reason the apostle Paul, when conversant with the Jews, punctually observed the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, as he himself informs the Corinthians, 1 Ep. ix. 20. *Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews.* Knowing these things to be indifferent, he either observed or omitted them, as was most for the good of others. When among the Gentiles therefore he neglected the use of these ceremonies, that he might the more freely converse with them, as he also writes to the Corinthians: *To them that are without law*, that is, without the law of Moses, *as without law, (not being without law to God, but under the law of Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law.* Thus was he *made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some.*

Indeed when he was in the land of Judæa there was a further reason for his observing the law of Moses. It was the law of the country to all who were born Jews, and they were obliged to submit to it as such; which doubtless was one reason why the apostles, and other immediate disciples of our Lord and their successors, so punctually observed it in the



land of Judæa to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. They were to be *subject to the higher powers*, and to submit to *every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake*. Although these ceremonies were now become things indifferent, and were no longer the ordinances of God in the strict and immediate sense, yet, as they were required and enforced by the higher powers, they were to be complied with; and in this remote sense might still in the land of Judæa be called the ordinances of God. But although St. Paul, being born a Jew, himself willingly complied with all the ceremonies of the Mosaic law in the land of Judæa, yet when some would have imposed the same upon Titus, who was a Greek, and not under the same obligation, he would not permit him to yield to it.

There was a wide difference between the cases of Timothy and Titus. Timothy, being born of a Jewess, had a right to circumcision from his infancy, and wanted nothing but the performance of that ceremony to admit him to the freest conversation with the Jews: St. Paul therefore, needing his assistance among the Jews in Asia, circumcised him. Titus had no claim to circumcision, nor could Paul want his assistance among the Jews in Judæa. The Pharisaic Christians would have prevailed with him, and indeed with all who were converted from among the heathen, to be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses, teaching them that it was necessary to their salvation. These St. Paul resolutely opposed, because a yielding to it would have been a recognising and encouraging their doctrine, a doctrine which overthrew the whole scheme of Christianity, and rendered Christ's death vain and needless. Although



therefore circumcision, and other ceremonies of the law, were, in his esteem, things indifferent, and he could either use or neglect them as he saw fit; and accordingly did circumcise Timothy, to render him the more useful to himself in the ministry among the Jews which dwelt in Asia Minor; yet when circumcision was imposed as necessary to salvation, he firmly withstood it, and would by no means give way to the performing it, where it countenanced and encouraged so pernicious a doctrine; and this was in exact compliance with the decree of the apostles and elders. Whoever will be at the pains to read the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul's Epistles, will find not only a perfect consistency between his doctrine and practice, but a great steadiness and constancy in both.

It is the easiest thing imaginable now to answer each of the queries put by rabbi Isaac. The first is, "Wherefore did Paul circumcise Timothy, since "Christ was to profit him nothing?" Had St. Paul, in circumcising Timothy, done it as a thing necessary to his salvation, the rabbi might well have asked this question. But since it is most apparent that St. Paul did it not with this view, but only as a thing indifferent, in order to facilitate the conversion of the Jews, what room is there for this question? St. Paul well knew that Christ would not profit Timothy the less for his being circumcised, when he submitted to it as a thing indifferent, and did not depend on it for his salvation.

The second query is, "Since Paul did circumcise "Timothy, wherefore did he not enjoin him to keep "all the Mosaic precepts, when Paul testifies to "every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor

“to do the whole law?” It is very clear the apostle understands it of those only who submitted to circumcision as a thing necessary to their salvation. Now, forasmuch as St. Paul did not circumcise Timothy with any such view, he might well leave it to his discretion to observe the precepts of the ceremonial law, so far as he thought proper; though doubtless, when conversant among the Jews, he so carefully observed it, as to make himself acceptable to them, which was the very end of his being circumcised.

A third query is, “Behold, even Paul himself was circumcised: wherefore then did he not perform the precepts of the Mosaic law?” It was not St. Paul’s opinion that every man who had been circumcised in his infancy was a debtor to perform the whole law of Moses, but only those who underwent it, or depended on it as necessary to salvation, and this after they had professed a belief of the Christian doctrine. St. Paul, no doubt, while a Jew, thought himself obliged to perform the precepts of the law of Moses, and was very careful in observing them. But when he became a Christian, he learnt that the ceremonial law was abrogated by the death of Christ, and for this reason persuaded the Christian converts from among the Gentiles, that there lay no obligation on them to comply with it.

The last query is, “Wherefore did he initiate his disciple Timothy by the precept of circumcision, if, as the Christians will have it, the season or time of observing the law of Moses was now past?” He did not initiate Timothy because he thought he was under any obligation from the law of Moses so to do: the time or season of observing

that, as made necessary by the divine command, he truly thought was over and gone: but he did it as a thing indifferent, in order hereby the more easily to convert those of the Jewish nation.

Another objection is made from Acts xvi. 30, 31. where the gaoler asks of Paul and Silas, *What he must do to be saved?* The answer returned is, *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.* “You see here, that these “disciples agree not in their exhortations with the “doctrine of Jesus. For when a rich man asked “advice of Jesus how he might obtain salvation, he “did not enjoin him to believe in himself, but commanded him to keep the precepts described in the “law of Moses, as you will find Matt. xix. 16. “Mark x. 17. Luke xviii. 19<sup>y</sup>.” This is an objection that, I think, may be safely trusted with every reader: for is there any contrariety, any inconsistency between these two things, believing in Jesus, and obeying the commandments of God? are they not both necessary? When the rich man applied to Jesus for instruction in so great a point as that of obtaining his salvation, it might well be taken for granted that he did believe in him as a teacher sent from God: it would have seemed therefore very unseasonable to urge this upon him. Our Saviour, who knew the hearts of all men, took a much more pertinent and suitable method to lay open his defects both of belief and practice. He saw plainly, notwithstanding his boasted obedience to the divine law, that money was his god: he therefore puts him upon the trial which he would choose, God or

<sup>y</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. cap. 75.

the world. This man could not find in his heart to give up the world, took that as his portion, and betrayed his want of faith and obedience. But the Jew will have it, that the direction of Jesus to this man is, that he should keep all the precepts of the law of Moses, and that it is hence incumbent on every Christian so to do, in order to his being saved. See part 1. ch. 49. n. 2, 3. and part 2. ch. 19. Whereas the instances given by our Lord in this place are all commands of a moral nature, and taken from the second Table. But had he been as explicit in his injunction to this man to keep the whole ceremonial law as the rabbi makes him, could it be inferred from thence that Christians are now bound to keep that law? It is certain, that during our Lord's life that law was in force, and every Jew was obliged to keep it in order to his being saved: it was not abolished but by his death: and our Lord plainly foretold the abrogation of it to the woman of Samaria.

The last observation made by rabbi Isaac on the book of Acts is on ch. xxviii. 3, &c. When Paul shook off the viper that had fastened on his hand, and the Barbarians saw no harm come to him, *they said that he was a god*. "You plainly see here " that the foolish people, who erred concerning Jesus, fell into the same mistake concerning Paul, " and called him also God<sup>r</sup>." This sure was written by the Jew in a very great hurry, or he could not have been guilty of so egregious a blunder. Did he ever hear of or meet with Christians in any part of the world who held that Paul was God? It is here

<sup>r</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 76.

expressly said that they were Barbarians, that is, natives of Melita, who had never before seen St. Paul, nor as yet heard one word of Christ; these, astonished at St. Paul's miraculous escape, believe him to be one of their deities, as, some years before this, did the people of Lystra upon his having healed a cripple there. A like injudicious remark the rabbi makes upon the history of Simon Magus, related Acts viii. to which also he here refers. It is said that Simon had so prevailed on the Samaritans by his sorceries, as to be esteemed by them *the great power of God*. "Hence," says the Jew, "may be drawn an argument against the miracles of Jesus, which were performed by the magic art; and therefore the silly people that followed him believed him also to be God<sup>a</sup>." Should any one argue, that because Pharaoh's magicians turned a rod into a serpent, water into blood, and produced frogs, therefore all the wonderful works of Moses were wrought by the magic art, and were no proof of the power of God assisting him, would the rabbi allow the consequence? The very answer which he must return to this will be our answer to him.

<sup>a</sup> Chiz. Em. p. 2. c. 65.

## CHAP. XX.

*Other objections answered.*

HAVING answered the several objections raised by rabbi Isaac, I shall next consider all other objections that I can recollect either to have heard or read started against any part of this sacred book. It is said that the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of St. Matthew agree not in the relation of the death of the traitor Judas. In the one it is related, that *he went and hanged himself*<sup>a</sup>: in the other, that, *falling headlong, he burst asunder, and all his bowels gushed out*<sup>b</sup>. These accounts are represented as inconsistent the one with the other. It is urged, “that if he hanged himself he “did not die by a fall, and the gushing out of his “bowels. And if his falling headlong was the cause “of his death, it was not his hanging himself.” Before I proceed to give a direct answer to this objection, I would observe to you, that different circumstances, mentioned by two or more persons in relating the same facts, by no means affect the credit of the relators, or destroy the credibility of the facts, unless they are plainly contradictory the one to the other; because they may each have their course or season, and be all true.

Should several persons be called as witnesses, who saw a man travelling in the road between London and Northampton; and one should affirm, that he saw him on foot without any retinue; another

<sup>a</sup> Matt. xxvii. 5.<sup>b</sup> Acts i. 18.



should say, that he saw him in a coach drawn with six horses, attended with a great number of servants; another, that he saw him on horseback with one servant only; might it not be objected exactly in the same manner as it is to the holy writings? These circumstances are inconsistent: if he was on foot, he was neither in a coach nor on horseback; and if he was in a coach, he was not on foot. One declares he had no attendants; another, that he had many; and a third, that he was followed by one servant only. How can these things agree together? If these witnesses be further examined, and it appears that they each of them saw this man in different parts of the road; that the one saw him walking on the road towards Islington, the second in a coach and six between Islington and St. Alban's, and the third on horseback near Dunstable, the testimonies of these persons are very consistent. Nor is it any thing improbable, that a person should walk to Islington, go thence in a coach and six to St. Alban's, there mount his horse, and ride to Dunstable in his way to Northampton.

If we make but the same allowances to the sacred writers, that is, if we suppose the different circumstances mentioned by them not to have happened the same moment of time, but to have followed one the other, nothing can be more clearly consistent than are the different circumstances they relate. St. Matthew says, *Judas went and hanged himself*. This he thought sufficient to say of the traitor, without adding the other circumstances of his death which followed. St. Peter mentions those circumstances only which followed after he had hanged himself; *that falling with his face to the ground,*

*he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.* He hanged himself, and whether the cord with which he did it slipped or broke, or that to which it was fastened gave way, or some person, seeing him hanging, hastily cut him down, he fell with his face to the ground, and the violence of the fall burst his belly, so that his bowels gushed out; which, if he was a corpulent and heavy man, or was so swollen, as many of the ancients represent him to have been, might easily happen.

That which I apprehend has chiefly misled persons in making this objection, is their mistaking the meaning of the words which we have rendered *falling headlong*, *πρηνῆς γερόμενος*. They take it, that they must needs signify a person's throwing himself headlong from a house, a precipice, or some high place. And were this the proper signification of the words, there would be two different ways of death mentioned by the two historians: for a person's hanging himself, and throwing himself off from the top of a house or a precipice, are two different deaths. And although it is possible a person might first fasten a halter to a tree, and put the noose about his neck, and then throw himself off from an adjoining precipice, (which indeed would be making sure work, because if the one did not take effect, it is likely the other would; and this, if ever practised, might best suit the horrid state of the traitor's mind,) yet, as we read not of any such example, it may not seem to all so probable.

The words which are in our translation rendered *falling headlong*, signify properly falling or lying with the face to the ground. The learned Raphe-

lius<sup>c</sup>, who has made great search into Greek authors, with a particular view of thereby explaining the New Testament, affirms that he never once met with this phrase, where it signifies a man's throwing himself off from a precipice, or any high place. Nor could I ever see an example of it produced by those who put this signification upon it. Now if the words *πρηνῆς γενόμενος* never signify a man's throwing himself from a high place or precipice, there is not so much as the least pretence left that two different deaths are related, but only different circumstances attending the death of Judas. St. Matthew relates the main circumstance of his death, that *he hanged himself*. St. Peter mentions some circumstances which followed; *He fell with his face to the ground, burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out*. For it ought to be observed that St. Luke in the Acts is not relating the history of the death of Judas, but the words of St. Peter; and that the persons to whom St. Peter spoke well knew all the circumstances of the death of that traitor. The holy apostle had no intention therefore to give a punctual account in what manner he destroyed himself, but only to bring to the minds of his hearers the more affecting circumstances attending it, such which it might be supposed more fully shewed him an example of God's vengeance.

Several ancient writers affirm<sup>d</sup> that Judas lived

<sup>c</sup> Not. Polyb. p. 103, 109, fin.

<sup>d</sup> Œcumen. in Act. ii. Theophyl. in Matt. xxvii. 5. Euthymius in Matt. xxvii. 5. Cedrenus in Compend. Histor. p. 162. Theophanes, Hom. 27. p. 202. the two last cited by Suicer, Thesaur. tom. 1. p. 407.

some considerable time after he had hanged himself: that either the tree, to which he had fastened the rope, gave way<sup>e</sup>, or the cord broke<sup>f</sup>, or some person cut him down before he was suffocated<sup>g</sup>: that it pleased God hereby to grant him space for repentance, which he not improving became greatly diseased, was swelled to an enormous degree, was racked with grievous pains, was an eminent example of divine justice, and at length fell down with his face and belly to the ground, burst asunder in the midst, and his bowels gushed out. Were there sufficient authority to support this, doubtless learned men would have readily acquiesced in it. But as there is no more than a slender foundation for this piece of history, that is, that Judas so long survived the halter, the most easy and natural method of placing the several circumstances mentioned, as it appears to me, is that I have laid before you. Epiphanius, I think, is singular in his opinion, who supposes that Judas first shed his bowels, and then put an end to his life by hanging himself<sup>h</sup>.

Many among the moderns have taken a different way in their exposition of these passages of holy writ. They interpret the word used by St. Matthew, ἀπ' ἡγξάτο, not that Judas hanged himself, but that he suffered so severely from the anxiety of his mind for what he had done, that he fell into a deep melancholy, and died of a suffocation from grief<sup>i</sup>. Thus Dr. Hammond explains it. He says, "That which  
" the words most easily and promptly bear, and  
" which they might possibly mean by those words

<sup>e</sup> Theophyl.<sup>f</sup> Theophanes.<sup>g</sup> Euthymius.<sup>h</sup> Tom. 3. Hær. 38. p. 126.<sup>i</sup> Grotius, Price, Suicer, Perizonius, &c.

“ which we interpret *hanging*, is this ; that he fell  
 “ into a violent suffocating fit of sadness or melan-  
 “ choly, and grieved so excessively as to wish him-  
 “ self dead ; and then suddenly fell flat on his face,  
 “ and then burst <sup>k</sup>.” It has, I think, been fully  
 proved by Perizonius, that the word ἀπήγξατο bears  
 this sense in the best Greek writers <sup>l</sup>. Others, who  
 put much the same construction on the word ἀπήγ-  
 ξατο, and who understand πρηνὴς γενόμενος to signify  
 a being thrown headlong from some high place, con-  
 ceive that he was, by his melancholy and despair,  
 driven to this method of self-murder. They are not  
 of opinion that he died immediately of a suffocation  
 proceeding from grief, but that such was the anxiety  
 and torture of his mind, that he threw himself from  
 some house or precipice, and so made an end of his  
 wretched life <sup>m</sup>. But I think it has been nowhere  
 yet proved that the words πρηνὴς γενόμενος will bear  
 that signification.

If the words could be shewn to carry that sense,  
 I should understand it to be done, not by Judas him-  
 self, but by others, after he had hanged himself <sup>n</sup>.  
 A man’s hanging himself was esteemed as a most  
 odious and infamous death both by Jews and hea-  
 thens <sup>o</sup>. Josephus tells us that it was the custom  
 with the Jews to cast aside those who had murdered

<sup>k</sup> In Matt. xxvii. 5.

<sup>l</sup> Vid. Raphel. Observ. Polyb. p. 102. 104. 106. et Alberti Ob-  
 serv. p. 219.

<sup>m</sup> Saldeni Otia Theolog. l. 2. Exercit. 8. §. 20. p. 389.

<sup>n</sup> Thus Raphelius in Observ. Polyb. p. 106.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Basnage, Annal. p. 385. §. 95. et Virgil. Æn. l. 12. ver.  
 602. Serv. in loc. Virg. cit. Apuleium, Met. l. 6. p. 130. aliosque  
 ibi cit.

themselves, and leave them unburied till the evening<sup>p</sup>. This throwing them aside might not improbably be the throwing them down some precipice; for they had many such in and near Jerusalem<sup>q</sup>. If then the words would admit of that signification, I should think it most likely that those who found Judas hanging, and cut him down, threw him off some precipice; there to remain a spectacle to all who passed by, till evening.

There are still other learned men among the moderns, that put the same interpretation upon the words *πρηνὴς γενόμενος*, as is most usually put upon the word *ἀπήγγξατο*, and hereby make St. Matthew and St. Peter to say one and the same thing, that is, that Judas hanged himself<sup>r</sup>. Alberti has shewn great ingenuity in bringing together several passages of the ancient Greek writers to make this sense of the words appear probable<sup>s</sup>. I cannot say that his arguments amount to demonstration: this however, I think, may be justly observed, from what has been said in answer to the objection before us, that when there are so many ways whereby the different circumstances attending the death of Judas, related by St. Matthew, and mentioned by St. Peter, may be shewn fairly consistent, that person must have a good-will to cavil at the sacred writings who makes this difference an objection against them.

There is a second objection formed from the words of the same verse; in the beginning of which St. Peter is represented as saying, *Now this man*, speak-

<sup>p</sup> De Bell. l. 3. c. 8. §. 5, prop. fin.

<sup>q</sup> Vid. Joseph. de Bell. l. 5. c. 4. §. 1, fin. Zacharias, when slain, was thrown down one. De Bell. l. 4. c. 5. §. 4, prop. fin.

<sup>r</sup> Erasmus, Castalio, &c.

<sup>s</sup> Observ. p. 219.



ing of Judas, *purchased a field with the reward of iniquity*: whereas St. Matthew informs us, that *Judas cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and went and hanged himself; and that the chief priests took the silver pieces, and bought with them the potter's field to bury strangers in*<sup>t</sup>. The objection is, How can it with truth be affirmed that Judas purchased this field, when it appears from St. Matthew that the high priests purchased it after his death? In answer to this I would observe, first, that St. Matthew does not say that the high priests purchased it after the death of Judas. Some of the ancients were so far from understanding the words of St. Matthew in this sense, that they were of opinion that Judas made his exit in this very field which they had purchased<sup>u</sup>; and the learned Grotius inclines to this opinion<sup>x</sup>.

2. Judas was certainly the occasion of this purchase. It was bought with the money he had received from the high priests. Had he not brought back these unjust gains, and restored them to the high priests, this field had not been purchased. Now it is not unusual with the sacred writers, as well as other authors, to put the occasion for the cause<sup>y</sup>. Thus is it said, that *a gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous*<sup>z</sup>. It is true, a bribe may be a temptation, or the occasion of a man's shutting his eyes against justice, but it is not

<sup>t</sup> Matt. xxvii. 5, 6, 7.

<sup>u</sup> Œcum. in Act. ii.

<sup>x</sup> In Acts i. 18.

<sup>y</sup> *Then shall ye bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to the grave.* Gen. xlii. 38. And how often is it said of Jeroboam, that *he made Israel to sin*? 1 Kings xiv. 16. and xv. ult. &c.

<sup>z</sup> Exod. xxiii. 8.

the efficient cause ; for that is the man himself. In like manner, though the high priests were the proper purchasers, the efficient cause, yet forasmuch as Judas was the occasion of it, is he also said, in a figurative sense, to purchase it. And let it be observed further,

3. That the word ἐκτήσατο, which is the Greek word in this place, is very frequently used by Greek authors in this figurative sense <sup>a</sup>. Thus is it said by the son of Sirach of him that lends his money, that *he has purchased to himself an enemy* <sup>b</sup>. And in the Proverbs we are exhorted *not to purchase to ourselves the reproaches of evil men* <sup>c</sup>. It may be urged, that it was not the intention of Judas to buy a field, it was accidentally only purchased with his money. In like manner it is not the intention of the lender to make the borrower his enemy ; but so it too often happens, and therefore is he said, κτήσασθαι, to have purchased to himself an enemy. It is not the design of any person to bring disgrace and infamy upon himself by his conduct ; yet this being the event of an ill-spent fortune, such a one is said to have purchased infamy to himself. Thus with regard to Judas, forasmuch as the buying the field was the event upon his restoring the money, therefore is he said to have purchased the field with the reward of his iniquity, which field was, is, and will be, an eternal monument of his infamy <sup>d</sup>.

Another objection is raised from the verse following, that is, the 19th. *And it was known unto all*

<sup>a</sup> See Whitby in loc.

<sup>b</sup> Ch. xxix. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Ch. iii. 31.

<sup>d</sup> Judas hunc agrum acquisivisse dicitur, non tanquam rem suam, sed tanquam æternum infamiæ monumentum. *Grot.* in Matt. xxvii. 8.

*the dwellers at Jerusalem, insomuch as that field is called, in their proper tongue, Aceldama, that is to say, the Field of Blood.* This is represented as what could not be spoke by St. Peter. It is alleged, that it is not probable he should tell his brethren, who could not but know this as well as himself, that the circumstances of the death of Judas, or the buying of the field, were things notorious at Jerusalem; much less, that he, who was a Jew, and talking with Jews in their own language, should teach them the name of the field in the Jewish language, and interpret it for them into Greek.

My answer to this is, first, that it is very difficult for us to judge what it might be proper for St. Peter to say to the audience which then heard him. There might be several, it may be, the greater part present, who were strangers at Jerusalem, and who did not talk the language then used there. How far the Galilean dialect differed from that at Jerusalem we cannot now judge; but that they did differ is evident, because St. Peter was known by his speech to be a Galilean<sup>c</sup>. Nor can we say with any certainty, secondly, that these are the words of St. Peter. Several learned men think that this whole verse contains the words of St. Luke, and that they ought to stand in a parenthesis. Nothing could be more proper than that St. Luke should inform his readers that these facts were notorious at Jerusalem, and should add, as a proof of that notoriety, the name put on the field purchased with the price of Christ's blood, and should interpret that name into the Greek, which was the language in which he wrote.

<sup>c</sup> Matt. xxvi. 73. Mark xiv. 70. Acts ii. 7.

If we take these therefore to be the words of the historian St. Luke, there is not the shadow of an objection remaining. And if I mistake not, most learned men judge those words, *in their proper tongue*, and the interpretation into the Greek, to be an addition made by the historian to the words of St. Peter, as being necessary to explain what St. Peter said to a Greek reader. And the other part, concerning the notoriety of the fact, might be very properly mentioned, if part of his auditors were strangers at Jerusalem.

It is said, Acts iv. 6, that Annas was high priest ; whereas, if we give credit to the historian Josephus, the high priest of the Jewish nation at this time was Joseph, called also Caiaphas. To this it has been already answered, that the name of high priest was given to all those who had once performed that office. Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas, had executed that high office for many years together ; and although he did not now perform it, he bore the name of high priest, as is fully evident from the history of Josephus. To this answer it may be objected, that St. Luke in his Gospel means otherwise, and that he ought to be his own interpreter. For in marking the particular time when John the Baptist began his ministry, he names the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, and describes it further thus ; that Pontius Pilate was then governor of Judæa, Herod tetrarch of Galilee, Philip tetrarch of Ituræa, Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene, and Annas and Caiaphas high priests. Annas, say the objectors, was doubtless high priest in the same sense as Pontius Pilate was governor of Judæa, as Herod was tetrarch of Galilee, Philip tetrarch of Ituræa, and Ly-

sanas of Abilene; that is, he was the person then exercising that high office. And if this be St. Luke's meaning here, why should it be interpreted otherwise in the Acts of the Apostles? Who can better explain the words of St. Luke than himself? To this place in St. Luke's Gospel they also object, that there are two persons named as executing the office of high priest at one and the same time; whereas it is evident from the History of Josephus, that in Judæa there was but one high priest in office at one time. So that they charge St. Luke with two errors: the first is, his asserting that there were two high priests in office at one time; the second is, affirming that Annas was high priest during the government of Pontius Pilate.

The whole force of these objections lies in one single point; and that is, the necessity of understanding St. Luke to speak of Annas in these places as the high priest of the Jewish nation then in office. If there be no necessity of understanding him in this sense, the objections entirely vanish. And that there is no such necessity, is very evident, because there is another good and sufficient reason to be given why Annas is named by him, and why he is placed before Caiaphas. The truth of the case is this: Caiaphas had the name of high priest, but Annas had the authority. Caiaphas was named by the Roman governor, and was the person then in office; but he was wholly under the influence of his father-in-law Annas, who had the chief power and credit with the people. Agreeably hereto, we are told by St. John in his Gospel, that the band, and the captain, and the officers of the Jews, when they had taken Jesus, and bound him, led him away to

Annas first, and then Annas sent him bound to Caiaphas the high priest <sup>f</sup>.

To confirm this to you the more fully, I need only read the character which the historian Josephus gives of this Annas in his book of Antiquities. Having related that that son of his who bore his name was made high priest, he adds, "The eldest Ananus, they say, was a most fortunate man; for he had five sons, and it happened that all these executed the office of high priest to God, he himself having before enjoyed that honour for a very long time <sup>g</sup>." Josephus writes his name *Ananus*; in the Hebrew it is *Hanan*. It is an indifferent thing in the Greek language which way it be terminated, whether by *ας* or *ος*, whether his name be read *Annas* or *Ananus*. When the war broke out with the Romans, Ananus and Josephus, the son of Gorion, were chosen governors of Jerusalem, as Josephus informs us in his book of the Jewish Wars <sup>h</sup>. In another place of the same book he tells us that he was "the eldest of the high priests, a most prudent man, and perhaps had saved the city if he had escaped the hands of those who had laid wait for his life <sup>i</sup>."

<sup>f</sup> Ch. xviii. 13. 24.

<sup>g</sup> Ἐπὶ πλείστον. L. 20. c. 8. §. 1.

<sup>h</sup> L. 2. c. 20. §. 3. et c. 22. §. 1, 2.

<sup>i</sup> L. 4. c. 3. §. 7. I take it here for granted that the Ananus spoken of, Antiq. lib. 18. c. 2. §. 1, 2. et l. 20. c. 9. §. 1. and the Ananus mentioned, de Vit. §. 38. and 39. and de Bell. l. 2. and l. 4. is the same person; because I cannot easily persuade myself that there were two persons living together of the same name, both of them high priests, and both of such very great eminence and authority. Fran. Lucas Brugentius, in Luc. iii. 2. is of the same opinion. That it might be so, is fully evident thus: Ananus



In the same book he tells us, that his murderers upbraided him with his kindness and benevolence to the people<sup>k</sup>; and a little after proceeds thus: “ I  
 “ should not swerve from the truth, should I affirm  
 “ that the beginning of this city’s being taken was  
 “ the death of Ananus; and that the wall was over-  
 “ thrown, and the affairs of the Jews ruined from  
 “ that day in which they saw the high priest, who  
 “ presided over their safety, slain in the midst of  
 “ the city. For he was indeed a man venerable,  
 “ and most just in other respects, but delighted in  
 “ parity. Notwithstanding the eminence of his birth  
 “ and dignity, and the honour he attained to, he  
 “ liked that there should be an equality of honour  
 “ even to the meanest. He was a lover of liberty  
 “ to excess, and an admirer of democracy, always  
 “ preferring the public good to his own private ad-  
 “ vantage, and esteeming peace above all things.  
 “ For he knew that the Romans were invincible,

was made high priest in the thirty-seventh year after the Actiac victory. Antiq. l. 18. c. 2. §. 1.

Augustus reigned 57 years 6 months and two days.

Take away 14 years which Antony reigned with him,

And there remain 43 years 6 months and two days.

Take away 37

There remain 6 years 6 months and 2 days.

Tiberius reigned 22            7            7

Caius            3            8

Claudius            13            8            20

In Nero’s            12th Ananus was killed.

58            5            29

If we suppose him thirty when made high priest, (and he might have been younger,) he could be but in his eighty-ninth year when slain.

<sup>k</sup> C. 5. §. 2, prop. init.

“ and foresaw that the Jews must necessarily perish  
 “ in the war, unless they dexterously made up mat-  
 “ ters by a peace. And to say all in one word, had  
 “ Ananus lived, matters had certainly been made up,  
 “ and a peace concluded: for he was a skilful orator,  
 “ and able to persuade the people, and had now got  
 “ the upper hand of those who put obstacles in his  
 “ way, and were for the war. How very long would  
 “ the Jews have protracted the war, and what im-  
 “ mense trouble would they have given the Romans,  
 “ under such a leader! To him was joined Jesus<sup>1</sup>,  
 “ inferior indeed, when compared with him, but ex-  
 “ celling all the rest. And I cannot but think that  
 “ God, having condemned the city to destruction, as  
 “ being polluted, and having determined that the  
 “ sanctuary should be purged with fire, cut off those  
 “ who adhered to it, and had an affection for it.  
 “ They therefore who but a little before were clothed  
 “ with the holy vestments, and presided over the  
 “ public worship, and were adored by those who  
 “ came from all parts of the world to the city, were  
 “ seen to be cast forth naked, to become the food of  
 “ dogs and of wild beasts. Methinks Virtue herself  
 “ must have groaned over these men, lamenting that  
 “ she was herein so signally vanquished by Vice.”

The principal part of the character of Ananus,  
 you see, is his benevolence towards the people, his  
 love of parity and of the public good. It was for  
 this he seems to have been chosen high priest by the  
 Romans. For Josephus expressly says, that Quirinus  
 the Roman governor, finding the people seditiously

<sup>1</sup> This was another who had been high priest, and was next in  
 age to Ananus. See l. 4. c. 4. §. 3.

disposed towards Joazarus, who was his immediate predecessor in the high-priesthood, took the office from him, and conferred it on Ananus<sup>m</sup>; and no doubt it was for the same reason that the high-priesthood was continued so long in his family. He executed that office himself, Josephus says, ἐπὶ πλεῖστον, *a very long time*. I judge it to have been about fifteen years, which, as things were then managed, was a very long time. Soon after it was given to his son Eleazar<sup>n</sup>, who enjoying it one year, it was held by another for the year following, and then conferred on Caiaphas, son-in-law to Ananus<sup>o</sup>, who held it, as I judge, about eleven years; then was given to his own son Jonathan<sup>p</sup>, after that to his son Theophilus<sup>q</sup>, and then, having been enjoyed for some space by another person<sup>r</sup>, was offered again to his son Jonathan, who refusing it, and recommending his brother Matthias, it was, according to his desire, conferred on Matthias<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>m</sup> Jos. Antiq. l. 18. c. 2. §. 1.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. §. 2, prop. fin.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. c. 4. §. 3, fin.

<sup>q</sup> Cap. 5. §. 3, med.

<sup>r</sup> Antiq. l. 19. c. 6. §. 2.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. §. 4. And some time after this on his son Ananus, l. 20. c. 9. §. 1. so that, as Valesius rightly observes, from the time he was appointed high priest by the Romans, he may be said to have been perpetual high priest to the end of his life; for such he was by his authority with the people, and the influence he had over those who succeeded him. Nam cum Annas socer esset Caiaphæ, et paulo antea pontificatum gessisset, summamque inter Judæos auctoritatem obtineret, merito cum Caiapha conjungitur a Luca, non in Evangelio solum, sed in cap. iv. Actuum Apostolorum. Quippe hic Annas vir fuit sui temporis celeberrimus ac potentissimus, et quasi quidam perpetuus pontifex. Ex quo enim summus sacerdos factus est a Quirinio, ipse deinceps reliquo vitæ tempore aut per filios aut per generos suos sacerdotium administravit, ut testatur Josephus, qui illum semper Ananum nominat.

Nothing, I think, can shew a more perfect knowledge of the times, and be more expressive of what was the true state of the case, than are the words of St. Luke, *Annas and Caiaphas being high priests*. Annas had executed the office of high priest many years, and thence retained the name. Josephus himself from that time gives him the name. Thus, when he mentions Eleazar's being made high priest, he calls him Eleazar the son of Ananus the high priest<sup>t</sup>. In the same manner, when his brother Jonathan had that high office bestowed on him, he calls him Jonathan, the son of Ananus the high priest<sup>u</sup>. Caiaphas, it is true, was the high priest now in office, but doubtless was both made and continued such by the interest of his father-in-law Ananus, who before this had power sufficient to bring in his son Eleazar, and after this, four other sons. It may therefore, I think, be easily allowed that Caiaphas was under the influence of his father-in-law; that although Caiaphas had the name, Annas was in truth the governing high priest. There is no room then to admire, that St. Luke, in reckoning up the high priests and their kindred, who met together in council, should name Annas first, as being far the most considerable and powerful of all who convened; or that in enumerating the several princes and governors in and near Judæa, when John the Baptist

Cum igitur tunc temporis tota sacerdotii auctoritas penes Annam resideret, mirum non est, si cum Caiapha pontifex nominatur a B. Luca. *Vales. not. in Euseb. E. H. l. 1. c. 10.*

<sup>t</sup> Ἐλεάζαρον τὸν Ἀνάνου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως υἱὸν ἀποδείκνυσιν ἀρχιερέα. L. 18. c. 2. §. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Ἰωνάθην καθίστησιν Ἀνάνου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως υἱόν. Ibid. c. 4. §. 3.

began his ministry, he should say, *Annas and Caiaphas being high priests.*

Nor was this method wholly unpractised in the Old Testament; for in reckoning up the great officers under king David, Zadok and Abiathar are said to be the priests; and although Abiathar was the high priest then in office, yet is Zadok always named before him<sup>x</sup>; because, as I take it, though Zadok was not the high priest at that time in office, yet was he much the more eminent person of the two. This I take to be the most easy and natural account of the matter before us, and therefore the true one.

Learned men have various other conjectures, some of which I will lay before you. Selden<sup>y</sup>, Saubert<sup>z</sup>, and some others, think that Annas presided over the great council of the nation, and Caiaphas under him; or, as the Jews express it, that Annas was prince of the sanhedrim, and Caiaphas father of it; that therefore these two are joined together by St. Luke, and Annas placed first. Nor can there be the least doubt made, but that a man of such power and interest as Annas must have enjoyed the chief posts in the Jewish government. Accordingly we find, when the war broke out with the Romans, he and Josephus the son of Gorion were made governors of Jerusalem. Whether he was Nasi, that is, prince of the sanhedrim, we cannot certainly say, because history does not inform us. And if credit may be given to

<sup>x</sup> 2 Sam. xx. 25. xv. 35. xvii. 15. and xix. 11. 1 Chron. xv. 11.

<sup>y</sup> De Success. in Pontif. l. 2. c. 12.

<sup>z</sup> Jo. Saubertus de Sacerdotio Hebræorum, p. 647. cited Wolf. Cur. in Luc. iii. 2. See also Hammond on Luke iii. 2.

the Jewish writers, it was Gamaliel who at that time filled up this post <sup>a</sup>.

The learned Samuel Basnage and others are of opinion, that Annas and Caiaphas were high priests that executed the office annually by turns. This is founded chiefly on the words of St. John, that *Caiaphas was high priest that year* <sup>b</sup>, which may signify no more than that Caiaphas was at that time high priest. But they understand St. John to mean, that he was the high priest of the year current: that as he succeeded Annas in the high-priesthood at the beginning of that year, so at the end of it was he to resign it to him <sup>c</sup>. But of the truth of this interpretation there is very little probability <sup>d</sup>. It is indeed evident from Josephus, that the two high priests who preceded Caiaphas were each in that office one year only <sup>e</sup>. But that Annas and Caiaphas executed the high-priesthood annually and alternately, he is wholly silent. All that Josephus says of Caiaphas is, that he was put into the high-priesthood by Valerius Gratus, and turned out of it by Vitellius; whence it is concluded, and that very justly, that Josephus understood he was high priest during the whole of that interval.

Casaubon <sup>f</sup>, Scaliger <sup>g</sup>, Grotius <sup>h</sup>, Reland <sup>i</sup>, and

<sup>a</sup> See Lightf. vol. 1. p. 2009.

<sup>b</sup> John xi. 51.

<sup>c</sup> Annal. vol. 1. p. 232. §. 11.

<sup>d</sup> Nor does it solve the difficulty; for if they were alternately high priests, they were not so together.

<sup>e</sup> Antiq. l. 18. c. 2. §. 2, prop. fin.

<sup>f</sup> Exercit. p. 216.

<sup>g</sup> Proleg. Euseb.

<sup>h</sup> In Luc. iii. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Antiq. Heb. p. 154. See also Lightf. vol. 1. p. 911, 912. et Quandt. Dissert. de Pontificis magni Suffraganeo, p. 55. cit. Wolf. Cur. in Luc. iii. 2.



others, think that the one of these was the high priest, and the other his Sagan, as the Jews call it, or suffragan. It is evident from Josephus, that in case of pollution another was appointed to officiate in the high priest's stead<sup>k</sup>. But whether this person was properly the Sagan mentioned in the Mishna<sup>l</sup>, remains a dispute both among Jews and Christians<sup>m</sup>. There is frequent mention made of the Sagan of the priests in the old Jewish writings<sup>n</sup>. They describe him as next to the high priest both in dignity and authority<sup>o</sup>, so that he was much the same to the high priest as in after-times was the suffragan to the bishop. If there were such an office as this at the times we are speaking of, (and we have no reason to make a doubt of it,) it is not in the least improbable but that it was Annas who now executed it. He having been high priest so many years himself, and having so great weight with the people, who so likely as he to have a place of that dignity conferred on him?

It has been objected by Porphyry of old<sup>p</sup>, and by a Jewish writer of later days<sup>q</sup>, that Ananias and Sapphira, whose history we have, Acts v. were un-

<sup>k</sup> Antiq. l. 17. c. 6. §. 4. mentioned also in the Gemara, cited Selden de Success. in Pontif. l. 1. c. 11. §. 1. and Lightf. vol. 2. p. 397.

<sup>l</sup> Ioma, c. 3. §. 9. Shekalim, c. 6. §. 1.

<sup>m</sup> See Lightf. vol. 2. p. 397.

<sup>n</sup> Vid. Buxtorf. Lex. Tal. in voc. Segan; Selden. de Success. in Pontif. l. 2. c. 1; et de Syned. l. 3. c. 8. §. 6.

<sup>o</sup> See Lightf. vol. 1. p. 911, 912. vol. 2. p. 397. et 608. et Seld. de Syn. l. 3. c. 8. §. 6.

<sup>p</sup> Hieronymi Ep. 8. et August. contra Parmenianum, l. 3.

<sup>q</sup> Kidder's Dem. vol. 2. p. 220.

justly and cruelly treated. But this objection arises wholly from the want of considering the great heinousness of their guilt, and the necessity there was of such an example of punishment. These two persons, though they had seen the wonderful effects of the effusion of the Holy Ghost on the disciples, yet imagined that they were able to deceive the apostles, and the Holy Spirit, by which they were guided. Having sold their land, and professing to bring the whole price, and lay it at the apostles' feet, they brought but part, and reserved part to themselves. Herein was a great complication of crimes. The first was pride, ostentation, or vainglory. For there was no law obliging them to sell their estates, and surrender the money into the apostles' hands: this was left wholly to their own choice. The next was avarice. They would have appeared to the world to have brought their all; but such was their love of money, they secretly retained part, and would have thenceforth lived upon the common stock, as though they had divested themselves of all, which would have been a constant robbery both of God and man. And whence should arise this covetousness, but from a secret distrust of God's providence? They were afraid to commit themselves wholly to the divine care. To conceal this, they are guilty of dissembling and lying: and to whom do they lie? Not to the apostles only, but to God. They vainly hope that their avarice and hypocrisy are unknown to God himself, and that they might securely make profession of offering him their all, when in truth they offered but part. This also was sacrilege, and in effect denying the omnipresence and omniscience of the divine Being. Therefore St. Peter says to Sapphira, *Why is it that*

*ye are thus agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord*, that is, to distrust his knowledge, and make trial of it?

Was it not highly fitting, that in the first rise of Christianity such aggravated and complicated guilt as this should be exemplarily punished, that all might hear and fear? Was it not indeed necessary that the holy Spirit of God, under whose direction were the apostles, should at such a time as this discover his knowledge of the most secret crimes, in order to assert his own omniscience, establish the authority of the apostles, and give clear demonstration of the truth and certainty of the doctrines they preached? Was it not in the same manner at the beginning of the Mosaic institution, in order to confirm the power of Moses and Aaron, and more fully prove that Moses spake from God, that Nadab and Abihu were devoured by fire<sup>r</sup>? that Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up by the earth<sup>s</sup>? and that Korah and his companions perished<sup>t</sup>.

Another objection is taken from the speech of Gamaliel, which is in Acts v. 36, 37. where he is represented as saying, *Before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves: who was slain; and all, as many as obeyed him, were scattered, and brought to nought. After this man rose up Judas of Galilee, in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him: he also perished; and all, as many as obeyed him, were dispersed.* To this is opposed the History of Josephus, who relates,

<sup>r</sup> Lev. x. 1, 2.

<sup>s</sup> Numb. xvi. 32.

<sup>t</sup> Numb. xvi. 35.

“ that when Fadus was procurator of Judæa, Theudas prevailed on a very great multitude to take with them their wealth, and follow him to the river Jordan. For he gave out himself to be a prophet, and said, that the river, dividing at his command, would afford them an easy passage: and by these sayings he deceived many. Fadus suffered them not long to enjoy their madness, but sent a body of horse against them, which, falling upon them unexpectedly, killed many, and took many alive. They took also Theudas himself, cut off his head, and carried it to Jerusalem<sup>u</sup>. ”

This, Josephus expressly tells us, happened during the administration of Fadus, who was made procurator after the death of king Agrippa, in the fourth year of the emperor Claudius, and many years after the speech is said to be made by Gamaliel. It is therefore urged, that words are put into the mouth of Gamaliel by St. Luke which he never spoke; that he is represented as relating an event which it was impossible he should at that time have any knowledge of, having in truth happened many years after.

The whole force of this objection rests upon this single supposition, that the Theudas mentioned here by Josephus, and the Theudas of whom Gamaliel is represented as speaking, is one and the same person. And this is attempted to be proved from the sameness of the name, and the similitude of circumstances. Each boasted himself to be somebody, had a number of followers, and was slain. But these being circumstances which are common almost to

<sup>u</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 5. §. 1.

all impostors who raise a rebellion, they by no means prove the point for which they are brought. On the other hand, there are also circumstances mentioned in which they widely differ: first in point of time. The Theudas Gamaliel spoke of, he expressly says, was before Judas of Galilee, who rose in the days of the taxing. Whereas the Theudas of Josephus was under the procurator of Fadus, so that there was about forty years distance of time between them, if not more. In the next place, the Theudas of Josephus gathered together a much greater body of men than the Theudas of Gamaliel. Josephus says, *πλεῖστον ὄχλον*, *a very great multitude*: whereas Gamaliel says, a number of men, about four hundred. Of the very great multitude gathered by Theudas, Josephus asserts, many were killed, and many were taken alive. Whereas Gamaliel affirms, that his Theudas being killed, all his followers were scattered.

The great difference of time therefore, and other circumstances, make it plainly appear to demonstration that they are two different persons. Nor is there any argument to the contrary to be drawn from the name, because Theudas was a name at that time very common among the Jews<sup>x</sup>, and is thought by not a few learned men to have been the same name with Judas<sup>y</sup>. Origen<sup>z</sup> and others of the ancients<sup>a</sup> agree that there was a Theudas who

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Grot. in loc.

<sup>y</sup> See Usher's Annals, p. 797. Syn. Crit. in Matt. x. 3.

<sup>z</sup> Θεοδᾶς πρὸ τῆς γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ γέγονέ τις παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις. Adv. Cels. l. 1. p. 44. et l. 6. p. 282, fin.

<sup>a</sup> Chrysostom. Œcumen. Theophyl. in loc. aliiq. cit. Whitby in loc.



made an insurrection before the taxing under Cyrenius. And Josephus himself affirms, that at the time when Archelaus went to Rome to be confirmed in his kingdom, there were very many insurrections, in relating several of which he gives us the names of the leaders; but it is abundantly evident from his words that he omits more than he names<sup>b</sup>. At this time therefore it is probable the Theudas of Gamaliel rose. The learned archbishop Usher thinks, that Judas the son of Ezechias, who, as Josephus relates, at this time raised a rebellion, and would have gotten the government into his hands, was the Theudas mentioned by St. Luke<sup>c</sup>; but this is uncertain.

Before I quit this head, I would observe in the general, that the silence of Josephus in any particular point of history is no good argument against the truth of it, because his History is so very brief, in many places passing over a number of years without relating any remarkable fact. He says not one word of the death of Judas the Galilean, or of the dispersing his followers; and yet sure no one ever doubted of these facts because he hath not asserted them. He has expressly told us that Judas excited the people to rebellion, and had many followers<sup>d</sup>. And he afterwards tells us, that his two sons were put to death by Tiberius Alexander the

<sup>b</sup> Antiq. l. 17. c. 10. §. 4—8. Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ καὶ ἕτερα μύρια θορύβων ἐχόμενα τὴν Ἰουδαίαν κατελάβανε πολλῶν πολλαχόσε——ἐπὶ τὸ πολεμεῖν ὠρμημέναν, mentioning afterwards only three by name.

<sup>c</sup> Annals, p. 797.

<sup>d</sup> De Bell. l. 2. c. 8. §. 1. Antiq. l. 18. c. 1. §. 1. Καὶ ταύτης ἐραστῶν εὐπορηθέντες.



Roman procurator<sup>e</sup>. He does not so much as mention the crimes for which they were executed, though I suppose every one who reads him takes it for granted that it was treading in the steps of their father, and raising a mutiny among the people to propagate his doctrine. Hence some have imagined, that the Theudas spoken of by Josephus might not improbably be the son of the Theudas mentioned in Gamaliel's speech<sup>f</sup>, it having been no unusual thing for children to follow the example of their parents.

Another objection arises from comparing Acts ix. 7. with Acts xxii. 9. In the former place it is said, *And the men which journeyed with Paul stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.* In the latter, *And they that were with Paul saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to him.* This may be represented as contradictory; but is easily explained to us by what is related, John xii. 28, 29. where it is said, *Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again. The people therefore, that stood by, and heard it, said, that it thundered: others, said, An angel spake unto him.* Many of the bystanders heard only a noise like thunder, but heard not the particular words spoken. So it was with St. Paul's companions: they heard a sound, probably like that of thunder; but heard not the particular words spoken. It must also be observed, that the word ἀκούειν signifies *to understand* as well as *to hear*, and that almost as frequently. St. Paul's com-

<sup>e</sup> Antiq. l. 20. c. 4. §. 2.

<sup>f</sup> See Lightf. vol. i. p. 766.

panions heard a voice, but did not hear it so perfectly as to understand what was said.

There is one objection more taken from Acts xiii. 20. where St. Paul says, *And after that he gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet.* This is represented as inconsistent with 1 Kings vi. 1. in which it is said, that Solomon's temple was begun to be built *in the four hundred and fourscore year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt.* But forasmuch as the four hundred and fifty years mentioned by St. Paul are the exact computation of the numbers set down in the Book of Judges, and the First Book of Samuel <sup>g</sup>, the

<sup>g</sup> The Israelites were under	Judges	Years.
Chushan-Rishathaim . . .	iii. 8.	8
Othniel . . . . .	iii. 11.	40
Eglon king of Moab . . .	iii. 14.	18
Ehud . . . . .	iii. 30.	80
Jabin . . . . .	iv. 3.	20
Deborah . . . . .	v. 31.	40
The Midianites . . . .	vi. 1.	7
Gideon . . . . .	viii. 28.	40
Abimelech . . . . .	ix. 22.	3
Tola . . . . .	x. 2.	23
Jair . . . . .	x. 3.	22
The Philistines . . . .	x. 8.	18
Jephtha . . . . .	xii. 7.	6
Ibzan . . . . .	xii. 9.	7
Elon . . . . .	xii. 11.	10
Abdon . . . . .	xii. 14.	8
The Philistines . . . .	xiii. 1.	40
Samson . . . . .	xvi. 31.	20
Eli . . . . .	1 Sam. iv. 18.	40
Total		450

It is highly improbable, if not next to impossible, that these numbers should so exactly coincide by chance only.

difficulty lies between the Book of Kings and those books<sup>h</sup>. And this doubtless was seen by rabbi Isaac; otherwise, we may be sure, he would not have overlooked such an objection as this.

<sup>h</sup> Nothing more easy than a mistake in transcribing numbers. Many learned men are of opinion, that the number, 1 Kings vi. 1. falls short of what it ought to be. And I am apt to think more would be of that mind, if it were not for the few lives which fill up far the greatest part of that time in the lineage of David, viz. Booz, Obed, and Jesse. This difficulty has occasioned some to feign, that there were three of the name of Booz, who succeeded one another, being grandfather, father, and son. The first the son of Salmon by Rahab, and the third the father of Obed. Vid. Usserii Chron. Sac. p. 200, fin. Even they who judge the number, 1 Kings vi. 1. to be right, are driven by this difficulty to suppose that Rahab was sixty-two when she was brought to bed of Booz, and that Booz was a hundred and two when he begat Obed, and that Obed was a hundred and eleven when he begat Jesse, and that Jesse was a hundred and eleven when he begat David. Vid. Usserii Chron. Sac. p. 200. Why may we not suppose that Booz was a hundred and seventy when he begat Obed, and that Obed was about the same age when he begat Jesse, and that Jesse was a hundred and forty when he begat David? This will fill up the whole time required, according to the computation of the Book of Judges, and the First Book of Samuel. And if we recollect that it was not long before this that the life of man was shortened, can we wonder that there should be many more instances of longevity at that time than are now to be found? The last century affords us two instances even in our own country of persons who lived to be upwards of a hundred and fifty. The one was Thomas Parr, of Shropshire, brought to London, and presented to king Charles the First in the year 1635, when he was a hundred and fifty-two years old, and some months over. Vid. Usserii Chron. Sac. p. 202. The other was Henry Jenkins, of Yorkshire, who died in the year 1670, being a hundred and sixty-nine years of age. See Eachard's History of England. It is remarkable, there are no less than eight lives to fill up much about the same space of time, from Eleazar to Zadok, in the genealogy of the high priests, 1 Chron. vi.

I have now answered all the objections that I have met with. If I had read or heard of more, I should willingly have put them down, and represented them in the strongest light I was able. For I am fully persuaded, that the book I am defending stands not in need of partiality, favour, or affection, but must and will approve itself true and genuine to all considerate, upright judges. I will not say that none have escaped my search. I cannot pretend to have read all things, nor is it possible for any man to say what some persons may esteem objections. Of those I have laid before you, several are mean and trifling enough. Others, that upon the first view, from an artful representation, may seem to carry some force with them, upon a very small explication totally vanish. Some few, it must be owned, contain real difficulties, arising from our imperfect knowledge of the history of those times, or it may be from a want of a more thorough skill in the Greek language, or possibly from a mistake made by some early transcriber. But what are these difficulties, when compared with the numerous arguments brought for the truth of the things related in this book? The most that can be said of them is, that there is a difficulty or two not easily to be accounted for at this distance of time, (and may we not well wonder that there are not many more such?) but no argument of weight against it, none that bears any proportion to the force of those many which have been produced for it. And I dare be bold to say, there is not that book extant in the world which has so much evidence of its truth, and so little to be urged against it, as this book has; and that if we deny our assent to the truth of the

things related in this History, we may as reasonably renounce the belief of every thing that is past of which we have not ourselves been eyewitnesses. And were the generality of the world thus incredulous, there must be an immediate stop put to business; there could be no commerce carried on between persons at a distance; there could be little or no justice administered, nor any polity exercised; and we must bid a final adieu to the comfort and pleasure of society.

---

# I N D E X.

---

- ABRAHAM**, youngest son of Terah, 545.
- Ace, vide *Ptolemais*.
- Adramyttium, a city and port, 344.
- Adria, part of the Mediterranean so called, 349.
- Adrian, vide *Hadrian*.
- Adultery, the woman taken herein, 144, 221.
- Ægyptian impostor, 63.
- Ælius, one of Cæsar's procurators in Asia, 283.
- Æmilius Paulus settled the government in Macedonia, 155, 337.
- Æsculapius, Great is Æsculapius, 276. Slaves exposed on the island of Æsculapius, 129, note 9.
- Agrippa, vide *Herod*.
- Agrippa jun. 46, 197.
- Agrippa, the Roman, friend of the emperor Augustus, kind to the Jews, 168, 169.
- Albinus, procurator of Judæa, 193, &c. dismissed malefactors for money, 203.
- Alexander the Great, 295.
- Alexander, a person of principal account among the Jews, 72.
- Alexandria, the metropolis of Egypt, great commerce between that and Italy, 346.
- Alexandria, vide *Troas*.
- Altar to the unknown God, 294.
- Alytarch, 279.
- Amphipolis, a city of Macedonia, 337.
- Amphitales, 279.
- Ananias the high priest, 64. was sent to Rome, 66. guilty of great injustice, 65. murdered, 71.
- Ananus sen. high priest, called also Annas, his character and influence, 590, &c. his speech, 180.
- Ananus jun. high priest, son of the former, a Sadducee, put to death James the brother of our Lord, 193, 212.
- Ancile, preserved at Rome, as what fell down from heaven, 281.
- Antigonia, vide *Troas*.
- Antioch, a city in Syria, 334. was free under the Romans, 147. a city in Pisidia, 333.
- Antipas, vide *Herod*.
- Antipatris, a city in Judæa, 356.
- Antiphilus receives fair speeches and money of the governor of Egypt for being falsely imprisoned, 323.
- Antoninus Caracalla gave the citizenship of Rome to all the free-born subjects of the empire, 122, 209.
- Apollonia, a city in Macedonia, 339.
- Apollonius Tyanæus set up in opposition to Christ, 429.
- Apollos with St. Paul at Ephesus, 380.
- Appeals to Cæsar usual, 329.
- Appii Forum, 352.
- Apuleius compared to Christ, 429.



- Aquila, 394.  
 Archelaus went to Rome to obtain the kingdom, 170. was banished to Vienna, 178.  
 Archisynagogi were ordained elders and judges, and saw their sentences executed in the synagogue, 109, 110.  
 Areopagus, 292.  
 Areopagites, 297.  
 Aristarchus, St. Paul's companion, 276, 395.  
 Artabanus, king of Parthia, 209.  
 Ascension of Jesus into heaven from Bethany, 360, 369.  
 Asia Propria, 335, 340.  
 Asiarchs, what their office, 277. more than one, were kind to St. Paul, 278.  
 Assembly of Asia, what, 285.  
 Assos, a city and port, 341.  
 Athenians, curious and inquisitive, 291. changeable, 289. make leagues of friendship with the Jews, 296.  
 Athens, full of idols, 290.  
 Atilius Regulus took Melita, 62.  
 Attalia, a city and port, 334.  
 Augustus, the emperor, kind to the Jews, 175. his decree, 241.  
 Augustal cohort, 302.  
 Barnabas, an ordained elder, 247.  
 Basilides, a heretic, 488.  
 Bernice, sister to Agrippa jun., 46.  
 Berea, a city in Macedonia, 339.  
 Bethany, 360.  
 Bethphage, 361.  
 Bithur had four hundred synagogues, 109.  
 Cæsar, Julius, made a decree, giving power to Hyrcanus, the high priest, to determine all religious differences among the Jews, 237.  
 Cæsarea, called before Stratonis Turris, a free city, 147, 340. distinguished from Judæa, 355.  
 Caius, the emperor, 37. gave orders to set up his image in the temple at Jerusalem, 310.  
 Candace, the usual name of the queens of Æthiopia, 64.  
 Captain of the temple, 106, &c.  
 Capua, the *duumviri* of this city called themselves pretors, 317.  
 Carpocrates, a heretic, 480, 488.  
 Castor, 298.  
 Celer, procurator of Cæsar, together with Ælius, 283.  
 Celsus, an Epicurean, inconsistent with himself, 427.  
 Cenchrea, the eastern port of Corinth, 340.  
 Cerdo, a heretic, 480, 488.  
 Chief man of Melita, the Roman governor so called, 62.  
 Chios, an island, 341.  
 Christians of the first ages knew well how to distinguish between frauds and real possessions 274  
 Churches of Lyons and Vienna send an epistle to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, 507.  
 Cilicia Aspera and Campestris, 334, 345.  
 Clauda, an island, 349.  
 Claudius, the emperor, 37. commanded the Jews to depart from Rome, 61.  
 Claudius Lysias, 63, 217.  
 Clemens Romanus, 399, 483, 484.  
 Clemens Alexandrinus, 401, 443.  
 Cnidus, a city in Caria, 346.  
 Cohorts legionary, 300. independent, 304. made out of the legions, and more honourable, 310.

- Colonies, differed from municipia, 120, 121.  
 Coloss, St. Paul had not been there, 385.  
 Coos, an island, 342.  
 Coponius, the first procurator of Judæa, 179.  
 Corinth, 339. St. Paul's stay there, 500.  
 Cornelius, the centurion, 302, 495.  
 Crete, an island, 346. had an hundred cities, 348. and many who wrote its history, 347.  
 Cumanus, procurator of Judæa, 309. would have screened the soldier, 190. took money of the Samaritans to protect murderers, 203. was for this reason banished, 66.  
 Cuspius Fadus, procurator of Judæa, did nothing contrary to the Jewish customs, 203.  
 Cybele, her image fell down from Jupiter, 280.  
 Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, 459.  
 Cyprus, an island, 332, 343.  
 Demoniacs, frequent both among Greeks and Romans, 258, &c.  
 Damascus, 234. had many synagogues, 108. a conspiracy to kill all the Jews there, 78.  
 David was not anointed king in Zion, 562.  
 Dearth, vide *Famine*.  
 Decuriones, what, 317.  
 Demetrius, the silversmith, 274, &c. prisoner with Antiphius, 323.  
 Demosthenes, his opinion of the Athenians, 291.  
 Derbe, a city in Lycaonia, 333.  
 Diana's temple at Ephesus, 275, 277. little models hereof were made, 275, *Great is Diana!* a customary cry, 276. her image usually made after the form of that at Ephesus, 282.  
 Diana Taurica, her image said to fall down from heaven, 281.  
 Dora, a free city, 147.  
 Drusilla left her husband Azizus, and, contrary to the Jewish laws, was married to Felix, procurator of Judæa, 43.  
 Duumviri, who, 317.  
 Egnatia Via, 339.  
 Egypt, vide *Ægypt*.  
 Elders, Jewish, who, 98.  
 Eleazar, a Jew, dispossessed demoniacs in the presence of the emperor Vespasian, 257.  
 Ephesus, 340. the citizens were wardens of the temple of Diana, 280.  
 Ephesian enchantments, 267.  
 Epictetus blames the Christians for laying down their lives, as guilty of rashness and obstinacy, 410.  
 Erastus, St. Paul's companion, 395.  
 Essenes, exact in their judicial proceedings, 198. bound themselves by horrid oaths to observe their peculiar rites, 254.  
 Eusebius, 453.  
 Eutychus, 503.  
 Excommunication, 254. the Jews did not excommunicate their elders or doctors, 246.  
 Exorcists, 257, 501.  
 Fair Havens, in Crete, 346.  
 Famine, under Claudius, 56, 60.  
 Feet, scholars sat at their master's feet, 103, &c.  
 Felix, procurator of Judæa, 38. was so many years, 41. his ingratitude, 44, 68. his injustice, 45. encouraged private murder, 203, 256.  
 Festus, procurator of Judæa, 38, 45, 46.

- Flavia Domitilla, niece of the consul Clemens, banished to the isle of Pontia, 407.
- Florus Gessius, procurator of Judæa, 313. shared the booty with robbers, 204.
- Fulvia, a Roman matron, a proselyte to the Jews, 78.
- Gaius, St. Paul's companion, 395.
- Galatia, 334, 340, 382.
- Gallio, proconsul of Achaia, 52. brother to Seneca, 53. would not interfere with the Jews in their religious controversies, and sit as judge of them, 55.
- Gamaliel, president of the council, 71, 102, 215. had many scholars, 82. and it was usual for the presidents so to have, 102.
- Gauler was to suffer the same punishment as was due to the malefactors who made their escape, 320.
- Garlands, used in sacrificing, 287.
- Gaulus, an island, 350.
- Gaza, a free city, 147. had been desert, 353.
- Gazith, the room in which the sanhedrim sat to hear capital causes, 204, 205. the sanhedrim moved from thence forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, 205. this their removing a voluntary thing, and they did sometimes return, *ib.*
- Gessius, *vide Florus.*
- Gospel, preached first to the Jews in every place, 397. widely spread, 398.
- Gospel of St. Luke, *vide Luke.*
- Governors of provinces had their council, 329. often sent persons to be tried at Rome, 330. had full business, 158.
- Gratianus, proconsul of Asia, 409.
- Greek cities, both in Europe and Asia, free, 145.
- Hadrian, the emperor, compassionate to slaves, 129. just to Christians, 409. surprised that any ancient municipia should desire to be made colonies, 120.
- Helena, her charity, 56.
- Hellenists, who, 78.
- Heretics, in the ancient church, were not Christians, 454, 469.
- Herod the Great built a temple to Augustus, 356.
- Herod Agrippa, his remarkable death, 38. was zealous for the Jewish rites, 48. his letter to the emperor Caius, 183.
- Herod Antipas, 74, 229.
- High priests, who so called, 95. not to go into the holy of holies more than once a year upon pain of death, 183.
- Historians descend not so low as to the execution of ordinary criminals, 199. nor to minute particulars, 211.
- Hyrcanus, ethnarch and high priest of the Jews, 237. was constituted judge of all differences that should happen about the Jewish institution, *ib.* patron of the injured Jews in all parts of the Roman empire, 239.
- Jacob's descent into Egypt, 548, &c.
- Jaddus, the high priest, meets Alexander the Great, 295.
- James, the brother of our Lord, put to death, 193.
- Iconium, 333.
- Jerusalem, 357. had four hundred and eighty synagogues, 109.
- Jews washed their hands before prayer, 253. said their prayers, and built synagogues, near the sea or some river, 252.

- allowed all persons to speak in their synagogues, 247. excommunicated both themselves and others, 254. interpreted the Law and the Prophets as they read them, 79. persecute the Christians every where, 378. have an aversion to the Greek learning, 81. petition for liberty, 242. had a court in every city where they lived, 237. sent money to Jerusalem, 236. were too favourable to murderers, 206. many of their customs confirmed, 264.  
 Illyrians enjoyed their own laws, 146.  
*Imperium merum et mixtum*, 116.  
 John Baptist, forerunner of Christ, 362.  
 John the apostle lived at Ephesus, 438.  
 John, a person of great note in the Jewish nation, 72.  
 Jonathan the high priest procured the government of Judæa for Felix, and was basely murdered by him, 44, 68.  
 Joppa, a free city, 147. a sea-port, 353.  
 Irenæus, 435, 440, 472.  
 Isauria, 333.  
 Italic cohort, 303.  
 Judas the traitor, 367, 579, &c.  
 Judas the Galilean, author of a new sect, 186. his opinion madness, *ib.*  
 Julius, vide *Cæsar*.  
 Jupiter, *Καταβάτης*, 286. *Πολιεύς*, 287. oxen usually offered to him, *ib.*  
 Justin Martyr, 400.  
 Lacedæmonians, a free people, 149.  
 Lasæa, a city in Crete, 348.  
 Laws, the Roman and Jewish laws contrary the one to the other, 189.  
 Lazarus, the rulers of the Jewish nation consulted to put him to death, 227.  
 Legates, ten were usually sent by the Romans to assist the general in settling the government and laws of the countries they conquered, 155.  
 Legions, 300, 309.  
 Lesbus, an island, 341.  
 Libertines, 94.  
 Liberty, granted by the Romans to the nations they conquered, a precarious thing, 162.  
 Lictors, 318. tore the clothes off from those they scourged, *ib.*  
 Luke was with St. Paul when first a prisoner at Rome, 434. his Gospel and the Acts, two parts of one and the same work, *ib.* his Gospel published before the reign of Nero, 483.  
 Lucian, the dialogist, speaks of the readiness of Christians to lay down their lives, 410. and of their having all things common, *ib.* note <sup>2</sup>.  
 Lycaonia, 333.  
 Lycia, 343, 345.  
 Lycians, a free people, 150.  
 Lydda, 354. the distance thence to Cæsarea, 355. thence to Antipatris and Jerusalem, 358.  
 Lydia, formerly called Asia, 335.  
 Lysias Claudius, 62, 217.  
 Lystra, 333.  
 Macedonians left free by the Romans, 146, 154.  
 Magic practised both by Jews and heathen, 265. our Lord's miracles imputed thereto, 428, &c.  
 Magistrates had reason for fear when they had scourged a Roman, 324.  
 Magnesia, 342.

- Manaen, 73, &c.  
 Marcion the heretic, 448, 450, 480, 488, 489.  
 Marcus Antoninus, the emperor and philosopher, blames Christians for their readiness to lay down their lives, 409, 410.  
 Mark, 390.  
 Massilia, a free state, 148.  
 Mede, Joseph, his doubts resolved, 257, &c.  
 Melita, an island, 62, 350, 503.  
 Menedemus the philosopher, 289.  
 Mercury attended Jupiter, 286.  
 Miletus, how far distant from the Mæander and Ephesus, 342.  
 Miracles continued in the church, 415. till the Roman empire became Christian, 425.  
 Models of the temple of Diana, 275.  
 Modestus wrote against Marcion, 477.  
 Moses conducted by Providence, 524.  
 Municipia, of three kinds, 119, &c.  
 Murder, vide *Self-murder*.  
 Murderers, vide *Jews*.  
 Musanus wrote against Marcion, 477.  
 Myra, in Lycia, 345.  
 Mysia, 334.  
 Neapolis, a city of Macedonia, 335.  
 Nemausus, a free state, 149.  
 Νεώκορος, what, 278, 280.  
 Nero, the Roman emperor, 37.  
 New Testament, divided into Gospel and Apostle, 463, 470, note g.  
 Nicodemus, 226.  
 Oracles, the priests in giving forth oracles, inspired by their gods, 260.  
 Origen, 403, 451.  
 Ostia, cohorts were placed there for the prevention of fire, 300, 308.  
 Oxen were offered to Jupiter, 287.  
 Pachynum in Sicily, 350.  
 Palladium, 281.  
 Pamphylia, 334.  
 Pantænus, 443, 451.  
 Paphos in Cyprus, 333.  
 Papias, 439.  
 Patara in Lycia, 343.  
 Paul the apostle, had been a pharisee, 375. a persecutor, 374. had letters to Damascus, 234. was in Arabia, 375. many things concerning him omitted in the Acts, 373, 375. miracles wrought by him, 372. was a Jewish elder, and probably a judge, 245. why scourged and not excommunicated, 246. why submitted to be scourged by the Jews, being a Roman, 246. why he did not plead his privilege at Philippi before his being beaten, 321. how he found credit, 325. works at a trade, 249, 381. made converts in Galatia, 382. and at Troas, *ib.* 383. collected alms for the saints, 384. had not been at Coloss or Laodicea, 385. preached in Illyria and Dalmatia, 386. became all things to all men, in what sense, 387.  
 Perga, 333.  
 Petronian law, 129.  
 Petronius, governor of Syria, 310.  
 Phæstus, an ancient city in Crete, 348.  
 Pharisees, 84.  
 Philippi, 335.  
 Philosophers encouraged self-murder, 320.  
 Phœnice, in Crete, 349.



- Phœnicia, 343.  
 Phrygia, 334. had its own laws continued by the Romans, 147.  
 Pilate, Pontius, procurator of Judæa, 38. a bad governor, 203. removed by Vitellius, 208. the wicked king, who made the sanhedrim remove, 207.  
 Pisidia, 333.  
 Piso, proconsul of Macedonia, 157.  
 Plato was at no small pains to understand magic, 267. asserted all things to be full of demons, 260.  
 Pliny jun. his evidence, 400, 407.  
 Pollux, 298.  
 Polycarp, 438.  
 Pompey settled the states of Asia, 155.  
 Possessions believed by the ancient philosophers, 273.  
 Pothinus, bishop of Lyons, 440, 507.  
 Præfectus Prætorio had the charge of prisoners, 331.  
 Præfectus Vigilum put a slave to death, 128.  
 Pretors, the magistrates of colonies so called, 318.  
 Priest's daughter burnt, 200.  
 Priests oppressed by the high priests, 65, 70.  
 Priests, vide *High Priests*.  
 Priscilla, 394.  
 Prisoners bound to a soldier with one chain, or to two soldiers with two chains, 327. sent to Rome to be tried, 330.  
 Privileges allowed the Jews, 164, 182.  
 Proconsuls of Asia, why more than one named, 282.  
 Proculus cured the emperor Severus, 419.  
 Proselytes of two sorts, 76.  
 Provinces of the Romans were very much lessened when the Roman law was universally imposed, 209.  
 Ptolemais, a city in Phœnicia, 343.  
 Pythagoras, 260, 267.  
 Pythia, 269.  
 Python, 269. the name of Delphi, *ibid*.  
 Pythonissa, 269, &c.  
 Puteoli, a city in Campania, 351. a port for the Alexandrian ships, *ibid*. a cohort placed there for the prevention of fire, 300, 308.  
 Question, or examining persons by torture, part of the Roman law, 326.  
 Quirinus, proconsul of Syria, settled the government of Judæa, 156, 178.  
 Rabban, a higher title than that of rabbi, 71.  
 Rabbi, doctor or teacher among the Jews, 249.  
 Resurrection, 85.  
 Rhegium, a city in Italy, 351.  
 Rhodes, an island, 342. a free state, 149.  
 Roman, unlawful to beat him with rods, 322.  
 Roman procurators did not execute the Jewish laws, 187. put none to death but for treason or rebellion, 200.  
 Roman soldier tore the sacred books, *ibid*.  
 Romans made not the same settlement in all the places they conquered, 176. forbade the introducing strange worship, 316.  
 Romans, such who pleaded the privilege of being Romans, and were not so, severely punished, 326.  
 Sabbath day's journey, 360.



- Sailing, how far the ancients could sail in a day, 345.
- Salamis, a city in Cyprus, 333.
- Salmone, a promontory in Crete, 346.
- Samaria, a country and city, 354.
- Samos, an island, 341.
- Samothracia, an island, 335.
- Sanhedrim, or Jewish council, 98, 210. were afraid of the people, 227. and therefore accused our Lord before Pilate, 231. would have put the apostles to death, 214.
- Sardinia used its own laws, 146.
- Saron, a plain country, 354.
- Saturninus, a favourite of the emperor Tiberius, 78.
- Saul, king of Israel, a demoniac, 262. reigned forty years, 558.
- Scholars sat at their master's feet, 103.
- Scribes, who, 98.
- Seleucia, a free city, 147. a port in Syria, 332.
- Self-murder encouraged by the ancient philosophers, 320.
- Seneca, the philosopher, brother to Gallio the proconsul, 53.
- Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus, 51.
- Severus the emperor kind to Christians, 419.
- Sicarii, 256.
- Sicily had its own laws, 146, 187.
- Sidon, a free city, 147. and port, 344. Cæsar's decree sent thither, 238.
- Silas, St. Paul's companion, 317, 391.
- Simeon, son of Gamaliel, 72, 82.
- Simon the sorcerer, 75, 265.
- Slaves of all professions, 314. divining slaves rare, *ibid.*
- masters might put them to death, 128.
- Soldier tore the sacred books, 190.
- Solomon composed enchantments, 257.
- Sopater, St. Paul's companion, 396.
- Sorcery or magic, 265.
- Stephen the protomartyr, his trial, 211.
- Stocks, what, 319.
- Stoning, a punishment among the Greeks, 288.
- Strangers, passing the bounds in the temple, put to death, 182, 191, 218.
- Suetonius, witness of the persecution the Christians suffered, 405.
- Synagogues built near some river, 252. persons scourged in them, 111.
- Syracuse, a city in Sicily, 350.
- Tacitus describes the sufferings of the Christians, 405.
- Talmudists believe a transmigration, 85.
- Tarsus, 150.
- Taurica Diana fell down from heaven, 281.
- Teachers among the Jews, how distinguished, 248.
- Temple of Diana, a most magnificent edifice, 274.
- Tertullian, 402, 418, 445.
- Tertullus the orator's speech, 215. agrees with what St. Paul says, 216.
- Thales affirmed all things were full of demons, 260.
- Thessalonica, 339, 499.
- Theudas, a common name among the Jews, 600. the same with Judas, 601.
- Tiberias had thirteen synagogues, 109.
- Tiberianus, his letter to Trajan, 408.

- Tiberius Alexander, procurator of Judæa, did nothing in prejudice to the Jewish laws, 203.  
 Timothy, 392.  
 Titus; why Timothy was circumcised, and not Titus, 566, &c.  
 Titus the emperor, his speech, 181, 184.  
 Trajan, his decree in favour of the Christians, 408.  
 Transmigration, 85.  
 Tres Tabernæ, 352.  
 Troas called Antigonía and Alexandria, 503.  
 Trogyllium, a promontory and island, 341.  
 Trophimus, St. Paul's companion, 397.  
 Tychicus, 396.  
 Tyre, 343.  
 Tyre, a free city, 147. the distance from Tyre to Cæsarea, 344.  
 Van-Dale acknowledges that the Pythagoreans and Platonists believed possessions, 273.  
 Varus, president of Syria, 171.  
 Verres, governor of Sicily, 156.  
 Vespasian the emperor saw a demoniac dispossessed, 257.  
 Vitellius, governor of Syria, sent Pilate to Rome, 208. yielded to the entreaties of the Jews, 309.  
 Unknown God, probably meant the God of the Jews, 295.  
 Zelotæ, 256.

THE END.





## DATE DUE

[illegible]

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

212



BS2625.4 .B62  
The history of the Acts of the holy

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00069 6692